THE CAST-IRON MAN

John C. Calhoun and American Democracy

THE CAST-IRON MAN

John C. Calhoun and American Democracy

BY

ARTHUR STYRON

AUTHOR OF "THE THREE PELICANS; ARCHBISHOP CRANMER AND THE TUDOR JUGGERNAUT"

Calhoun, the cast-iron man, who looks as if he had never been born, and never could be extinguished. *Harriet Martineau.*

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.

NEW YORK · TORONTO

1935

STYRON

THE CAST-IRON MAN

COPYRIGHT • 1935

BY ARTHUR STYRON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED, INCLUDING THE
RIGHT TO REPRODUCE THIS BOOK, OR
ANY PORTION THEREOF, IN ANY FORM

FIRST EDITION



PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

CONTENTS

PAGE

ANTECEDENTS 3

I. THE PROPHECY 29
Agrarian Democracy [1782-1812]
The Revolution of 1800
Calhoun and Jefferson

II. THE MILLENNIUM 53
Popular Democracy [1812-1840]
The Revolution of 1828
Calhoun and Jackson

III. THE KINGDOM 235
National Democracy [1840-1848]
The Revolution of 1840
Calhoun, Clay and Benton

IV. THE JUDGMENT 325
Industrial Democracy [1848-1861]
The Revolution of 1861
Calhoun, Davis and Lincoln

POSTSCRIPT 359

SOURCES 409

INDEX 415

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

John C. Calhoun *Frontispiece*
Thomas Jefferson *Facing page* 28
Andrew Jackson 52
Thomas H. Benton 234
Henry Clay 234
Abraham Lincoln 324
Jefferson Davis 324
John C. Calhoun 358

ANTECEDENTS

Study the past if you would
divine the future.

Confucius

WHEN John Caldwell Calhoun was born at the Long Canes Settlement in South Carolina on March 17, 1782, the Modern Age which began with the Sixteenth Century Renaissance was just completing its crescent phase. For it was the Eighteenth Century, the Age of Enlightenment, which witnessed the final overthrow of the lingering medievalism of the Middle Ages and the substitution of those movements of the Nineteenth Century associated with Calhoun's life; movements whose present decadence now suggests to many the descendency of the Modern Age.

The Eighteenth Century was ushered in with little widespread mental activity, the masses (though stirred from their medieval unity by the Protestant revolution) having been scarcely touched intellectually by the contributions of Columbus, Copernicus, Newton, Bacon, Harvey and Descartes. The intellectual revolution of the Eighteenth Century differed, therefore, from those of preceding eras in that it stimulated a larger portion of the population with a popular liberalism purposing to get rid of arbitrary governments. John Locke, with his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, and Isaac Newton, with his *Principia Mathematica*, stood at the end of the dead era to systematize and interpret the intellectual activities of preceding times, and at the opening of the new era to point the way – Locke in the field of political philosophy, Newton in the field of natural science. On these twin corner-stones – a political philosophy based upon constitutional guarantees and toleration, and the idea of a mechanical world – the French intellectuals built the base upon which the Eighteenth Century reared its Enlightenment. The learned men of the day turned from theology and the classics to

rational philosophy and natural or physical science to complete the work of deposing God. Voltaire, personifying the French abstraction of reason which sanctified and justified almost anything, was the new apostle of the age; Rousseau, with his slogans and catchwords, was its press-agent; Montesquieu, with his great scholarship, was its eulogist; Diderot and his fellow-Encyclopedists were its statisticians.

At the same time the old economic life in town and country was being slowly transformed by the magic touch of invention; and out of the former restricted domestic system in the villages and the subsistence agriculture of the rural areas was arising a modernized industrial order and a new scientific agriculture with its greatly increased population. Kay's flying-shuttle increased the rapidity of weaving; Hargreave's "jenny" or frame could spin eight threads instead of one; Arkwright's spinning frame made cotton fibre available for the warp; Crompton's "spinning-mule" put an end to spinning as a hand-process; Whitney's cotton gin removed the seeds from cotton; Watt's steam engine furnished power to the textile machinery and later to steam transportation. Greatly increased production at cheaper costs, and the new markets for larger sources of raw materials, principally cotton; the factory system with its tendency towards urban centralization; the need of an increased system of transportation and communication; the stimulation of iron and coal industries; — all combined to initiate the industrial revolution and the consequent necessity for social reorganization.

With the disruption of the basic medieval concept of a homogeneous society with a uniform political, religious and economic life, it was inevitable that a new psychology and theology would be deduced upon which to ground an appropriate social science. The emphasis upon reason and the vogue for the new science with its experimental thesis and its insistence upon proof for all truths, brought a rejection of ecclesiastical theories both Protestant and Catholic. Deism, the fashionable Eighteenth Century religion, was merely a

movement to bring a logical and rational religion out of this revolt against the Church. But such theological victory of nominalism over realism was enlightenment in name only: permeating the masses (always susceptible to sentimentalism) it became a mixture of innovation, pedantry, scepticism and self-worship – a romanticism that confused even Rousseau.

The techniques of life – religious, economic, social and political – may be classified in categories, but an artistic device is required to explain their more subtle aspects. Such a device is literature, which in any age is a mirror of prevalent tendencies. Eighteenth Century literature, with its basis of cold rationalism, presented an aspect of marked monotony in contrast with that of the Seventeenth Century (the age of Shakespeare, Milton and Dryden) wherein literary changes had paralleled the developments of that era, the rise of the dominant Puritanism of the Commonwealth and what came after. Contempt for medievalism had brought a propensity for classicism, thus connecting Enlightenment with Renaissance humanism; the seeds of individualism and collectivism, sown by Calvin at Geneva, came to fruition in Rousseau's *Contrat Social* in which was embodied a popular State so all-powerful as to permit it to chop off a so-called Sovereign's head; the pronouncements of modern physicists that the world was One Creation and the apparently changeless laws of nature formulated in terms of mathematical equations by Isaac Newton, found intellectual justification in Voltaire's rationalistic abstraction of the One Good (a form of Jewish monotheism more acceptable to the Puritans than the rich diversity of Pagan art and thought preserved by the Church); the romantic conception of Divine Man was dignified in Hume's philosophical history and mordant Scotch satire that was more typical of the French than the English.

In England – the source of much of the South's, and almost all of New England's, reading – Addison, Steele, Swift, Defoe and Pope had by 1714 attained full reputation, bringing prose

to the deliberate unimpassioned form English literature still retains, and poetry to a rational heroic couplet. A new form of publication, the periodical, had also been brought into being. In the middle of the Century, when the reign of George II was nearing its end, literature was tremendously active, Richardson, Smollett, Thompson, Fielding, Johnson, Gray, Goldsmith and Wesley being at the height of their powers. Twenty-five years later, identified with the American Revolution, Jeremy Bentham was publishing his *Fragment on Government*, Gibbon the first volume of his *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, Adam Smith his *Wealth of Nations*, and Thomas Paine his *Common Sense*, while a second edition of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* was appearing in ten volumes. In the last years of the Century, when the French Revolution was raging, came the works of Burke, Mrs. Radcliffe, Lamb, Cowper, Lewis and Miss Burney; the poems of Burns, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Southey, Scott and Landor; and Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man.*

But alas! much of mankind's unhappiness has always been due to his failure to progress in the social sciences in pace with his advances in other sciences. Political absolutism was, in the Eighteenth Century, still the common characteristic of the national States of western Europe (Spain, the Netherlands, Portugal and France); despotism of central and eastern Europe. In England the theory of human freedom was more advanced than its practice: Hobbes's *Leviathan* was written in support of the idea of absolute government in opposition to the Puritan philosophies; and although admitting that sovereignty was vested in the people, argued that since the people were inherently unsocial, covetous and quarrelsome they ought to permit a sovereign the supreme authority to govern. Thus the right (by revolution) to remove a bad prince, a right firmly insisted upon by the medieval Church, was denied upon a mere rational basis for absolutism in contrast with the divine-right theories previously advanced by Bishop Bossuet in France and James I in England. Even Condorcet, Sidney,

Diderot, Montesquieu, and the Encyclopedists remained loyalists so long as the monarchies lasted.

In the light of the current intellectual revolution, however, this social science was archaic: men's minds, roused from previous political lethargy, were ready for action. Despite their personal lack of valour, the intellectuals had brought a new theory of liberty and political democracy on which the American and French Revolutions and the English reforms fed—to America through Jefferson and Lafayette and Franklin, to England through Voltaire and Montesquieu. Rationalism had invaded the sphere of practical politics! The American Revolution was heard round the world. Jefferson's ringing declaration, "All men are born free and equal" was set up as a practical standard of human relations. Finally there was the World Revolution (misnamed the French Revolution) which carried the keynote of liberalism, *Liberty, Equality, Fraternity* to the hearts of men everywhere, affirming anew the neglected values of the Christian tradition as a reproach to the old society which had neglected it. . .

GREAT purpose might have overridden men's fears of the dimly known New World but it could not provide ships and equipment and sustain communities until they had firmly established themselves in the new soil. Besides other factors which influenced American colonization, the new era of capitalism had led to the joint-stock company trading to the New World with the expectation of great profits; and this fact had much to do with making the colonies permanent and self-supporting—an independence which later was to be successfully asserted. That the Northern States followed closely after the pattern of the mother country while the Southern States sought to create an original pattern of life, was due to other than economic factors—geography and character, resulting in different ideas and outlook on life, being the most important. Habits and institutions are psychological and moral as well as legal and political.

The significance of linking English absolutism with New England Federalism was, therefore, deeply imbedded in the sectional division that had existed in America since the beginning of the colonies. According to Southerners of that time, the best explanation of New England was England (the former never having strayed far from the temper of the mother country), while the explanation of England was puritanism. That is, the English character as permanently Puritan was not confined to any period, first gathering force which led to its recognition in the Reformation, strengthening itself by its energy during the civil wars, assuming momentary sovereignty during Cromwell's Commonwealth, and later (still pursuing its futile aspiration to Absolute Right) affecting even after the Restoration the whole course of English life and thought. To its middle-class or mass-minded materialism England was definitely committed, even the aristocracy, though hating dissenters and equality, but untroubled by consistency, reinforcing its class with the professions and trades as the Georgians imported their Pitts and established the polling-booth.

New England Puritanism, already deep-rooted when Cromwell was a country gentleman of St. Ives, went through no such convulsions as it had in England, so that its Protestant individualism took its natural course of popular democracy. Thus Calvinism in New England was both a religious system (in that it was actuated by conscious religious motives) and a political movement (in that its exponents sought to alter the form and substance of constitutional developments to accord with their religious tenets). With the traditional aristocracy either eliminated or absorbed, the ruling class or "quality" was a middle class composed of the clergy, the professions, and the commercially successful. The dominant class being the clergy, and the established religion being Calvinism, Puritanism was thus the dominant factor in the life of the community.

Now, the Puritan idea in religion was personal freedom as

opposed to liberty. The historic idea of the Church – that Christianity embodies an ideal attitude of the spirit towards the universe rather than a set moralism for the community; and that, though the doctrine of Free Will for Salvation makes all men equal in the sight of God, the saintly and priestly hierarchy presents an analogy of *inequality* in the natural world – was repugnant to the Puritans just as Calvinism was repugnant to libertarians because it interfered with their personal liberty.

The Puritan belief that between God and man, between the Sacred Book and the profane reader, no ghostly intermediary was needed, led logically to freedom in political thought. If a man could read and interpret the Bible he could certainly pass judgment on affairs of State. Spiritual superiority was, therefore, a matter of Election; intellectual equality a matter of education; social equality a matter of success. Such liberalism as the Puritan possessed was the attitude of laissez-faire for industrial and commercial freedom, and of humanitarianism for improving society *by law*.

The illogic of these conclusions – or perhaps the falsity of the premise – produced curious paradoxes in New England. While establishing the social and intellectual equality of men, the Puritan denied, by his doctrine of Election, men's spiritual equality. And though the doctrine necessarily sanctified individualism, his natural passion for unity, being starved, led him to a sort of communism that became the collective unity of an army rather than of a religious group, in which the private life of the individual was vastly more important than his spiritual attitude towards the universe, thus creating a disposition for prying and coercion that revolted the libertarian.

But since Calvinism was designed for the puritanic and sentimental masses, it was expected to make virtues of their instincts. It appealed to their conservative instinct – that is, conservative in the sense of holding fast to what they had rather than in holding fast to tradition – by exalting the specialized or expert mind, thus dogmatizing mere opinion into

infallible prohibitions, and producing the "reformer" or follower of single-track plans regardless of other considerations. It appealed to the instinct for success by encouraging the will-to-power and giving to life a political meaning that justified greed. It appealed to the instinct for progress by distrusting traditional authority, thereby validating fads and innovations. It appealed to the herd-instinct of nationalism by opposing the alteration of the national character by the infusion of extraneous elements, and by substituting national loyalty for patriotism. It appealed to mass-sentimentality by its humanitarian liberalism, thus replacing Law and Democracy (true religious concepts) with prohibitions and uniformity. In short, it replaced liberty with freedom, leisure with work, and renunciation with force; and its central theme being that the Will of God must be done on earth as it is in heaven, the Puritan being the Elect knew just what the divine Will was and was preordained to impose it on a willing or an unwilling world.

In the South, where the population was largely composed of anti-Puritan English Cavaliers mixed with liberty-loving and realistic Huguenots, and Loyalist Scotch stock which had emigrated there after the final overthrow of the Stuart cause at Culloden and the subsequent destruction of the clan-system by the English government, and where the warmer climate had imposed a lesser degree of self-discipline and asceticism upon the masses and produced a more explosive temperament with a marked susceptibility to general ideas, the social outlook was vastly different. Disowning the self-relegated rule of churchmen, merchants and intellectuals, they preferred to be governed by a strong, self-conscious aristocracy which set a standard of manners and morals above the positive law—a medieval concept which marked the South at the beginning of the Nineteenth Century as the last large cultured society to value and take a stand for feudal remnants. In this sense she was anachronistic but not backward, for

surely there was much in the feudal system to be defended against Nineteenth Century sentimentalism. In this sense, anachronistic may even mean enlightened: if civilization is not mechanistic, then, though the mind naturally makes progress, the will stubbornly clings to objects – the wrong ones for want of the right ones. Moreover, if it be true (and history would apparently confirm it) that man is unable to advance in social science in pace with the other sciences, literature and art, it would follow that the more closely his social science coincides with his intellection the lower he is on the philosophic plane. Reformers who insist upon reconciling their materialistic environment with their opinions are invariably minor intellectuals and never philosophers, for the reason that their *summum bonum* is mere human comfort.

The wide diversity existing between the ideals and the social life of the South was not because her leaders were backward, but rather because they were sufficiently philosophical as a class to accept truth as paradoxical and not absolute. Transcendentalism they rejected as a philosophy not true to itself in that it justified materialistic optimism; and though the private opinions of many of them were deistic, outwardly they conformed to the tenets of the historic Church. Nationalism, the historical development and limitation of human society to replace the abandoned feudal system, they distrusted with its confusion of the tongues of Babel; but they readily assembled and eagerly assimulated fine libraries in which was collected the literature springing from those diverse tongues – a veritable Pentecostal Gift of Tongues revoking the Curse of Babel, to furnish light and warmth, wavering and gusty though it might sometimes be, upon the complexity of human history. Temperamental as well as intellectual converts to the most revolutionary and liberal thought of the day, they made no attempt to reconcile it with, and therefore did not bind it down by, social science; for in the last analysis it is temperament rather than intellection that makes men libertarian. True, this was a select

minority; but at the time it set the tone of thought and standard of conduct for the whole South.

The American Revolution was the test by fire which the Southern aristocracy withstood as a pleasant dew. Having little to gain and much to lose by a revolution, their sacrifice for abstract principles loomed larger even than it was. Nor were they seeking a popular cause: the masses, to whom several generations of abuse are necessary to stir them into rebellion (and even then they are inclined to attack weakness rather than tyrannical strength) were inclined to be loyal to old forms; and being handed back and forth between rulers (as Louis had handed Canada over to George) was of little consequence without mental formulations to back a revolt. And, as a matter of fact, British tyranny was largely a matter of propaganda, the Royal governors having made a good showing as a whole, and not being unpopular except as the agents of an inefficient British colonial system.

Though willing to stake their existence upon revolutionary principles and libertarian democracy, the Southern aristocracy well knew that disembodied ideas without counterpart in social life get nowhere; and therefore they proceeded to identify these ideas with the economic freedom necessary to develop the new native economy on which the American people were coming to depend. In thus repudiating old hierarchical classifications for the sake of new ideals – in fine, in defending liberty, democracy, and the right of revolution – they emerged from the Revolution stronger in prestige and more solid as a ruling class; while the New England aristocracy, clinging to English Toryism (which in America was neither aristocratic nor conservative) were shorn of the remnant of their prestige, and generally discredited or actually exiled. Thomas Jefferson, the revolutionary homespun aristocrat of Virginia, and John Hancock, the successful middle-class merchant of Massachusetts, were more than individuals in the Revolution against England: they were incarnations of the South's and New England's ideal of leadership...

EVEN at the First Congress the national division began to show itself. The chief point of discord was the power of the central Government; and though the South as a whole took the same position she had always occupied to protect her state or national sovereignty, she was eager to lend as much authority and dignity as possible to the central agency. For this reason, many of the old families were regarded as federalistic, and General Washington as such had been elected to office by the universal suffrage of the united nations. Immediately New England democrats found fault with him because, accustomed to the pomp and glitter of the Virginia Court, he appeared stiff and formal in his new office. In his progresses during congressional recesses he was careful to avoid Rhode Island entirely; and the Governor of Massachusetts, the narrow John Hancock, for a time refused to call on him first in Massachusetts for the reason that within the borders of that State the President held an inferior office to the Governor. But the hostile anti-federalism of New England quickly evaporated when such questions as protective tariffs, the control of commerce, the limitation of slavery, the funding of debts, and the charter of a bank having arisen, she realized that monopoly and protection could best be procured through a strong central agency and the chief benefits culled by those controlling that agency. The South, however, readily sacrificed her material interests in these matters for the honour of having the new Capital located on her soil; and so party division based upon sectional differences was temporarily avoided. Federalism was thus for the time being common in both the South and New England, with, however, the distinction that in the South it was conservative reaction, while in New England it was conservative pragmatism; and since practical endeavour, unlike honour, recognizes no obstacles to progress, the evolution of the party was subsequently identified with the politics of New England. At the same time republicanism (as the democrats then called their doctrines) was common in both sections, likewise with

the distinction that in the South it was embraced by a large part of the aristocracy as well as the masses, while in New England it was confined to the lower classes (the true aristocracy having been eliminated); so that in the South it preserved its ideological aspect and subsequently became identified with her politics, while in New England its limitations made it readily susceptible to the leaven of pragmatic federalism.

In the meantime the French Revolution, lasting ten years, was revolutionizing the world. In America, younger and more susceptible than the older conservative European governments, and founded more recently upon the principle of revolution, the effect was immediate. Unhappily sentiment was not uniform throughout the Union but varied between the two sections, thus providing another wedge in the sectional division already existing. In the "conservative" North the reaction was generally for strong government, stronger than revolution. In the libertarian South the sentiment, while deprecating the murder of the French Sovereigns and the ensuing heretical Terror in which the Girondists were erased and many innocent members of the aristocracy and masses butchered to satisfy the thirst for power of Robespierre and his infamous Council of Ten, was stronger than ever for the principle of revolution which recognized that justice free from sentimentality must suffer from the human limitation of cruelty in that justice involved punishment, and that the effects of the French Revolution had been greatly magnified by its swift velocity of descent so typical of the explosive French people in contrast to conditions in America where, the social hierarchy not being so definitely fixed at the time of the American Revolution, there were few light things to be carried to the top by the whirlwind, so that the same minority that had prosecuted the Revolution was enabled to establish an orderly government and thus spread the post-revolutionary excesses over the whole Nineteenth Century

instead of in a decade as in France. Moreover, it was apparent that taking the whole life of the French Convention under consideration, much good had been accomplished, despite the Terror, towards carrying forward the social and economic reconstruction of France.

England's declaration of war upon France was still another wedge being entered between the pro-English mercantile North and the pro-French agrarian South, the latter taking the position that England, who had first welcomed the French Revolution as eliminating France from consideration in carving up Poland, and even having little interest in the fate of Louis XVI, now that she began to see the French tumult was no mere local event but a universal attack on the economic foundations of society, giving birth to doctrines that challenged her own government, had undertaken to restore the Bourbons and the Church with no more justification than to serve the "conservative" (or fearful) instincts of Caermarthen and that mulish being, George III, as Jefferson declared. "Indeed," wrote the author of the Declaration of Independence, "the bullying and demonstration of England in behalf of the Prince of Orange, by which Dutch patriots were deprived and exiled and Holland robbed of her honourable independence to become a province of England, and her Stadholder reduced from the high station of the first citizen of a free republic to be the servile viceroy of a foreign sovereign, is sufficient reason to convince any reasonable person that England means to trouble the peace of France in the same way." If left to herself France might even have continued under the Girondists (the inheritors of the ideas of the Thinkers, and the soul of the Revolution, though they had no constructive program for acquiring their main end, the franchise) as the pre-eminent country among nations, the most benevolent and polite of peoples, and entitled to primacy by the same proof which gave it to Themistocles after the Battle of Salamis when each general voted to himself the first

reward of valour and to Themistocles the second, just as every enlightened patriot gave the first vote to his own country and the second to France...

It is a false premise of nationalism that inimical communities may be united by merely calling them one nation. For since minorities differ in what they want, the societies they create can have little in common, so that, like individuals, they remain on better terms apart. In any union of nations, therefore, the natural division of minorities must express itself in political division which sooner or later resolves itself into political parties. The division in America having reached this stage, that was exactly what was taking place... and in the President's own cabinet under the leadership of Thomas Jefferson, his Secretary of State, and Alexander Hamilton, his Secretary of the Treasury. Actually the President, a man of character rather than talents, a born leader but without the imagination to understand liberalism and yet anxious to heal the scars caused by sectional differences and the conflict over the ratification of the Constitution, took no part in the struggle; but as a member of an aristocracy which stood as a sort of preparatory school for liberal leadership, he traditionally belonged with Jefferson. Ostensibly, though, he favoured Hamilton, both because of a lingering suspicion of Jefferson's radicalism (carried over from colonial days when the young backwoods man had successfully defied the Lees and Washingtons and the other east-Virginian gentry represented at Williamsburg), and because of a personal liking for the handsome and brilliant young West Indian immigrant who had served as aide-de-camp to the Commander-in-Chief and had completely gained the latter's confidence as President so that he was permitted to execute, at the age of thirty-three, his cabinet post in the role of prime minister.

Hamilton, of obscure origin, was endowed with all the native traits of the successful climber – a cold and calculating nature and a talent for making ambition seem reasonable.

Having married into the New York gentry, his attitude towards the aristocracy was a mixture of resentment and admiration, of arrogance and envy. He maintained (for he was always really British in temperament) that the English precedents in government as they existed *prior* to the Reform Acts represented the logical conservatism of the ruling class (not having grasped the distinction that an American aristocracy to be true to itself must logically establish its own standard), and sought to enlist the interest of men of position and means in the new Government by pecuniary attachment through a loan and bank – advancing as the essential principles necessary for the support of a centralized government the love of power, force as constituted by coercion of laws or arms, and influence by a dispensation of honours and emoluments; even bribery, provided it was done *legally*, apparently being a legitimate influence. Thus the aristocracy would in time be replaced by a plutocracy; and as for that "great beast" the "turbulent people," democracy should be kept in check by a permanent President and a twelve-year Senate. So much for progressive Federalism as interpreted by its adherents' chief apostle.

To Thomas Jefferson, a true American democrat and homespun aristocrat, a man of wealth and culture and a friend of revolution, and above all an idealist and humanist with a sublime faith in and a firm reliance on the ultimate judgment of the common people, this Hamiltonian creed was no less abhorrent to all liberal principles than it was treasonable to the Constitution which, as a mere draft of a plan of government, had been breathed into life by the voice of the people speaking through their state conventions. If, then, the party of which Hamilton was the accepted prime minister had for its object the setting at naught of the Constitution and the expressed will of the people, and the establishment of that monstrosity, a democracy with a monarchical head, an opposition party was timely to embody the principles of liberty and democracy for which the Revolution had been fought.

"It is not by the consolidation or concentration of powers but in their distribution that good government is effected," declared Jefferson. "Were this great country not already divided into States, that division must be made that each might do for itself what concerns itself directly, and what it can so much better do than a distant authority. Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread... A capitalistic class based on manufacturing, banking and special privilege would exploit the people as ruthlessly as ever did Church, King or Pope, thereby creating class-hatred; and such a class would be even more dangerous in that, without legal status or privilege as a class, it would be difficult to reach." Thus he aligned himself with the agrarian groups in their struggle to improve their historically hazardous position, the elimination of the English creditors having brought a new enemy to the farmer in the Eastern capitalist.

Assisted by his brilliant young kinsman, John Randolph, Jefferson cautiously prepared for the trial of strength or bloodless revolution that was to determine whether America was to be a capitalistic oligarchy or a democracy. The cause gained unexpected popularity through an act of the Federalists themselves. Chief Justice Jay made a treaty with England which, though it postponed war with that country, was so pro-British that Jay, Hamilton, and even Washington, fell into disfavour. "I have been attacked in such indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero, to a notorious defaulter, or even to a common pickpocket," declared the President sadly; and though Jefferson energetically defended him, Washington was denied a third term and was replaced by John Adams of Massachusetts with Jefferson as Vice-President.

France, naturally angered at the Jay Treaty, now began to make it difficult for the new pro-French Democratic Party. James Monroe had proved so untactful a Minister that he had been withdrawn and no diplomatic relations existed be-

tween the two countries; and when President Adams sent a commission to the Directory (Napoleon was in Italy) that was met with Talleyrand's demand for money, Pinckney's answer, "Millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute," became the Federalists' rallying-cry. Hamilton, the "King of the Feds," inflated with distorted notions of arbitrary power, dreamt of a huge army which, allied with England's, should drive the French out of America and establish a great English-American Empire... with himself, perhaps, as King. President Adams had made the error of retaining in office Washington's chief advisers – all Hamilton's creatures – and this "Corrupt Squadron" began busily preparing for war against France. After the dispute with Algiers the Navy was reorganized, and the frigate *Constellation* actually attacked and captured the French frigate *l'Insurgente*. Alien and sedition acts, modelled on laws enacted by the British Parliament at the same time, authorized the President to corral aliens at specified places subject to good behaviour or remove them from the country, and added severe penalties for resistance to federal officials or for publication of whatever tended to bring the federal Government or its officials into disrepute – a piece of impudent tyranny that was promptly answered in resolutions (drafted by Jefferson) passed by the Kentucky and Virginia legislatures and transmitted to other States for action, asserting their right to pass on the validity of laws enacted by their common agency. "The Scotch Peddler," as Hamilton contemptuously referred to President Adams, now aroused by the insults of the Federalists, seized the first opportunity to make peace with France and rid himself of Hamilton and his creatures, among whom was the treacherous Timothy Pickering who was replaced by John Marshall of Virginia as Secretary of State, that office having been resigned by Jefferson.

The election, or really the Revolution, of 1800 was now imminent. Adams was the logical Federalist candidate (George Washington and Patrick Henry being dead, and

Jay refusing to re-enter politics), with Charles C. Pinckney of South Carolina as Vice-President. Jefferson was, of course, the Democratic candidate, on a ticket with Aaron Burr of New York, a disreputable but capable politician. Jefferson was promptly attacked by the Federalists as a radical, a revolutionary and an atheist; it was even asserted that with his election the ships would rot at their wharves, town streets would grow up in weeds, and workers would starve. But in spite of this warning, when the electoral votes were counted the Federalists were badly defeated and Jefferson and Burr each had an equal number.

It was clear that the people, nine-tenths of whom loved and respected Jefferson, wanted him to be President (Burr having been put on the ticket merely to procure the New York votes); but the Federalists, who had the majority in the House which had the privilege of appointing the President in case of a tie, in their blind hatred of Jefferson determined to appoint Burr. Hamilton, however, happened to hate Jefferson less than he hated Burr (a hatred that eventually led to the duel in which he was slain), and he used his influence in Congress to carry out the will of the people—and Thomas Jefferson became the third President of the United States...

THUS in 1800 occurred the first revolution of the American people against the federal Government through the civilized medium of the poll, in which they broke away definitely from the absolutism that had marked the past century and entered upon the work of the Nineteenth Century with a spirit of modern liberalism that was being recognized in America alone of all countries. It was a victory for the agrarian aristocracy and the common people of the whole country—Jefferson having erased the line between the North and South and substituted one between the East and West—and a justification of Southern doctrines insofar as they coincided with revolutionary principles which the South had jealously

guarded while the other sections were being weaned away from them by materialistic sops. The Reverend Timothy Dwight of Yale, speaking in general for all those to whom good government was that which protected their self-interests and strong government that behind which conservatives might hide their fear, and in particular for the New England "quality" whose disposition was ever to be the driver of the coach, thus greeted the new régime: "We have now reached the consummation of democratic blessedness. We have a country governed by blockheads and knaves. The ties of marriage (union) with all its felicities are severed and destroyed. Can the imagination paint anything more dreadful this side of hell?"

But the Federalists, though defeated at the polls, had one stronghold left – the Judiciary. Hamilton had always advocated cutting up the States into smaller divisions in order to increase the number and power of the federal courts, recognizing, like the French Terrorists who inaugurated the Tribunal, that the party dominating the administrative courts would possess the real power. So that, as soon as the results of the election of 1800 became known, the Federalists passed a law increasing the national judicial establishment; and twenty-three appointments – all out of proportion to the need – were placed in the retiring President's hands. As a last act in office Adams appointed John Marshall, the most gifted of the Federalists and the most competent for the task of subverting the legislative branch of the Government to the judicial, as Chief Justice. At midnight on March 3, 1801, Jefferson's Attorney-General, Levi Lincoln, entered the office of the Secretary of State, watch in hand, and ordered Marshall (according to rumour) to stop countersigning commissions.

It was fitting that the American Capital should be dedicated to use and the City incorporated by the first truly American administration, and amid scenes of such virginal simplicity as contained the administration's promises of the future. Since Washington had accepted the plans of Dr. Thornton and laid

the corner-stone of the capitol building seven years before, Hoban had completed the north wing of the building in a district of unkept waste-land; and here the state business had been moved the preceding year. The House, as the forum of a popular government, fittingly occupied the best quarters on the main floor; the Senate, as a mere congress of ambassadors of the various nations, had a small room in the basement, and the Supreme Court was not considered important enough to provide a place for.

In striking contrast with the elaborate ceremonial attending the two preceding inaugurations, the "Man of the Mountain," clad in a plain homespun suit such as any farmer might have worn, walked from the President's Palace, attended by the militia and citizenry, through the quagmire called Pennsylvania Avenue to the finished wing of the Capitol where John Marshall was waiting (with ill-concealed distaste) to administer the oath. Adams, as might have been expected from a President who refused to allow a Tennessee college to use his name on the ground that the Union would not last and there was no reason for New Englanders to promote a literary institution in the South and thereby "give strength to those who will be our enemies," had refused to greet his successor and had already vacated the City.

In his inaugural Jefferson made it clear that the principles of a lifetime were not to be abandoned: that while the requirements of circumstances should always be weighed against abstract ideas of right and justice, nevertheless reason and not force should answer the protests of the people. "The sum of good government is a wise and frugal government which shall restrain men from injuring one another, but which shall leave them free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labour the bread it has earned." Such strict construction of governmental powers meant the least possible interference in private matters, the largest autonomy of the individual, and *immunity against the government itself*. Such was the individual liberty

he proclaimed as against selfish industrial individualism which promoted enforced uniformity in effort and outlook and in the end would break its back on bureaucratic socialism.

This led Mr. Jefferson to the part which the people should play in such a government as he represented. "It is a sacred principle that though the will of the majority is to prevail, *to be rightful it must be reasonable.* The minority rights call for rights which equal laws must protect. Having banished religious intolerance we would gain little if we countenanced political intolerance, as despotic, as wicked, and as capable of the same bitter and bloody persecutions." As for men not being able to govern themselves, thus necessitating strong government: "If men are not capable of governing themselves, then are they capable of governing *others?* Or have we found angels in the form of kings to do the governing?" Thus he listed among his essentials of American government: "A mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped off by the sword of revolution where peaceful remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority, the vital principle of republics from which there is no appeal but to force, the immediate parent of despotism."

But though the philosopher Jefferson was concerned with the democratic liberties of the restricted agrarian state, the practical politician was unable to ignore the spirit of nationalism aroused by the growth of the new empire and the dangers besetting it. Spain was challenging the southern boundaries; France and England were belligerent; the Barbary pirates were preying on American commerce and carrying sailors into captivity; and ambitious citizens, such as Burr and Hamilton, were scheming to take advantage of the discontent beyond the Alleghanies since France had compelled Spain to retrocede Louisiana to her with its attendant threat of a new French colonial empire and the bottling-up of the Mississippi River to American commerce. Sacrificing his personal convictions, Jefferson finally purchased Louisiana from France, and sent William Clark and his secretary,

Meriwether Lewis (possibly he had been training the young men for that purpose), to explore the new country. The purchase of Louisiana aroused the ire of New England, the cradle of Federalism, and brought forth threats of secession from the Union—not, however, because the act was unconstitutional (as Jefferson himself feared it was), but because a united agrarian South and West (where there were now more than a million inhabitants) threatened New England's supremacy!—thus accomplishing what Mr. Jefferson with his purest democratic principles could never have wrought: the complete smashing of the Federalist Party and his own unanimous re-election.

The year Jefferson was re-elected Napoleon declared himself Emperor, greatly to the disappointment of his Southern sympathizers to whom it was a source of sorrow that the country that had furnished the world with the ideas behind the social forces of liberalism should be the first to throw them off and sink to the level of a military despotism. As a soldier Napoleon had been a superman; with a crown on his head he was merely an ambitious vulgarian. Of quintessential activity, a careful organizer of law and finance, and persuasive in propaganda, he possessed all the requirements of a great republican ruler able to translate abstract rights into practical ones, thus realizing most of the important constituents of liberalism; as an imperialist he was a plebeian who smirked over his successes, cultivated superficial arts and letters, practiced ceremonial according to the Hapsburg *ordo,* and risked everything to associate his dynasty with the Hapsburg's.

England and France now renewed their struggle, the former in the next year (1805) winning the Battle of Trafalgar off Spain (in which Lord Nelson was killed), and a few months later France retaliating at Austerlitz. In this deadlock both powers were determined to starve the other into submission, thus announcing to the world that there was no such thing as neutrality and that every other nation must take sides.

Orders-in-council were issued by both sides, defying neutrality by penalizing neutral shipping. Jefferson, far-sighted as always, retaliated with embargoes which he knew must eventually bring both sides to terms and without ultimate harm to American business (since the more goods that accumulated the more there would be to ship in the end); but business men, serving immediate rather than subtle ends, did not view his policy in the same light. The South lost heavily in the sale of staples; New England in shipping fees. But the easy-going South took her losses more philosophically than New England where talk of disunion was becoming ominous...

I. THE PROPHECY

Agrarian Democracy [1782-1812]

The Revolution of 1800

Calhoun and Jefferson

Democracy will itself accomplish the salutary universal change from the delusive to the real, and make a new blessed world of us bye and bye. *Carlyle.*

I

JOHN CALDWELL CALHOUN'S public career began in 1807 when he was twenty-six. In June of that year the British had outraged American neutrality when the *Leopard* fired upon the practically unarmed *Chesapeake* off the Virginia capes, forcing the latter to haul down her colours and submit to the indignity of being boarded by British sailors who took off four alleged deserters. Everywhere in America, except in those districts dominated by the disgruntled Federalists, resentment found expression. Inchoate national pride flamed into patriotism, obscuring for the moment the petty inconveniences of President Jefferson's embargo policy. Another war with England loomed as a probability; and the citizens of Abbeville, South Carolina (a town eight miles from Long Canes Settlement, Calhoun's home and birthplace), selected the young lawyer to write appropriate resolutions in popular support of the President, and to present them in a speech to a public assemblage of patriotic citizens. This was a signal honour to so young a man, and may be taken as evidence of the respect he had won in the few months since he had opened his law office at Abbeville following his graduation from Yale, his legal training at Tapping Reeve's Law School at Litchfield, Connecticut, his brief apprenticeship in Henry W. de Saussure's office in Charleston, and his recent admittance to the bar.

One may imagine the scene: the little court-house basking in the warm sun of early summer; the small audience of sturdy farmers and gentlemen planters; the speaker, tall and thin (he was an inch or two over six feet), his short-clipped dark hair standing up defiantly upon a wide brow, his blue-

grey eyes deepening to black with the intensity of his feeling, and dressed in the French-style dark coat with light Reseymere trousers and waistcoat (for only the old men still retained the knee-breeches and frilled shirt). The record of the speech and the resolutions has been lost, but one may imagine these too. . .

No doubt he began by speaking of the Revolution – for most of the older men present had taken part in that war – by which the American Colonies had won their independence as autonomous States or nations, and of the Union these nations had voluntarily formed. He had been a child of seven when General Washington travelled to New York to be inaugurated as first President of the United States, but he knew from hearsay about that momentous occasion, the encouraging spectacle of patriotic leaders assembled together with but one guiding thought – the welfare of their country. What wealth of proud memory their names invoked! – the President, erect and dignified in immaculate black satin, carrying his fifty-seven years lightly; stout John Adams of Massachussets, three years younger, who had proposed Washington as Commander-in-Chief fourteen years before and was now being recalled from his ministerial duties in Europe to become Vice-President; Patrick Henry of Virginia, a year younger than Adams, the same gaunt and intense fighter he had been in his youth; Dr. Franklin of Pennsylvania, infirm with age and near death, but still intellectually alert and concerned with his humanitarian projects. One kindred spirit had been absent – Thomas Jefferson, then serving his country in France; but he who had fought such bulwarks of privilege as entails and primogeniture, established religion, and even slavery, to promote the social and political rights of the common man, had been there in the transcendent power of an example that would never fail to stir to noble deeds the great Democracy to which he had given form.

Did the *Leopard* outrage mean another war? Yes – if it could not be avoided! America did not want a conflict with

England as President Jefferson's restrictive policies and his attempt to preserve our neutrality in the English-French conflict proved. The executive who failed to consider the weakness and ill-preparation of the infant Republic must be mad indeed. Calhoun was himself no admirer of the restrictive system and held the opinion that as a policy it must fail. But national honour must challenge any mere opinion and defy necessity as an alternative obligation. This generalization no doubt gave the speaker an opportunity to reproach the Federalists who by their defeatist and anti-war attitude were harassing and embarrassing the administration. What? Did the Union mean no more to men than the pecuniary advantages they derived from it? Was it true as John Quincy Adams – himself a loyal son of Massachusetts – had informed the President: that New England was plotting with the enemy to disrupt the Union? Calhoun himself could hardly credit it: unpatriotic New Englanders there might be, but New England herself was loyal. The common sacrifices of the sister-States for liberty had given the Union an indelible mark no party could erase. In a test the whole country would act as one. Let South Carolina be the first to assure the President of that!

So Calhoun might have spoken as a strong Jeffersonian Democrat and a back-country Unionist. Coming from that part of his State where the people had always opposed the special privileges of the eastern gentry (against which Jefferson had fought) and the Constitution because of its centralizing implications, the young lawyer was first of all an avowed Democrat – a persuasion he had ardently defended in his student days at Yale against its clerical President, Timothy Dwight, as he had later defended Jefferson against New England bitterness in general, so that, as he himself wrote, during his residence at Litchfield he had been practically a social recluse.

Calhoun's political convictions, however, were not so much a matter of personal admiration of Jefferson as they were the

result of a common background and similar characteristics. Both were backwoods men, products of the shifting frontier where American democracy had ever found new vitality, Jefferson from the very first West in American history, Calhoun from the second. Both were from prosperous upper-class families, and both later married into the wealthy and exclusive aristocracies centring respectively around Williamsburg and Charleston. Even in appearance and manners they were alike, both tall and awkward (though Calhoun might have been considered as handsome as Jefferson was ugly), both gentle in their manners and timid in the presence of the great.

But it was in their minds, or perhaps in their nerves, that they were most alike. Both were naturally gifted, both splendidly equipped by backwoods Scotch pedagogues for higher education, and, modestly admitting that men of talent must rise by their own volition, always eager to learn. Theirs was the generalizing type of mind – usually labelled visionary and sententious by the expert type – that endeavoured to grasp complex relations; but though this led them to love general phrases, they always strove to give them form as Jefferson had done in Virginia's famous Bill of Rights, written three weeks before the Declaration of Independence, which was largely taken verbatim from Locke's *Essay on Government*. In religion both were inclined to be deistic after the Eighteenth Century *Credo non quia impossibile;* but missing the light and warmth of the Christian faith in philosophy, both reacted from that vulgar approach to the Eternal, Calhoun, though reared a Presbyterian, adopting the Episcopal Church, and Jefferson, though still with a sworn enmity to all forms of tyranny over the mind of man which made him refuse institutional religion outside its own province, worshipping every Sunday while at Washington in the little tobacco-house employed by the Episcopalians as a church. In short, Calhoun and Jefferson were both Western gentlemen with Eastern polish, farmer-philosophers with a touch

of sentimentalism (inherent in their natures and intellectually derived from the French Thinkers), and liberals who admired the insurgent English Whigs, the fallen Earl of Chatham, the great orator Burke and his rival the brilliant Fox, and dreamers of an American Republic in the form of their ideal State.

What, then, was the key to the sympathy which existed between these polished and educated men of the world and their simple-minded and plain followers many of whom still wore buckskin breeches and hunting shirts and spoke only in the vernacular; between these avowed agnostics or religious liberals and their constituency composed of stern and unbending Calvinists; between these political particularists and the ardent backwoods nationalists; between these haters of war and the belligerent westerners; between these aristocrats, imitators and creators of a pattern of culture, and their following of natural romanticists whose highest standard was a naïve conceit? The answer was that both men, Calhoun no less than Jefferson, believed implicitly in the common man, particularly in him who followed the daily round of agriculture. "His breast is still the Almighty's chosen repository of truth," Jefferson had declared; and Calhoun, who before he was fourteen had practically memorized the *Rights of Man* by Thomas Paine (whom Webster classed with "the rascals Nimrod and Catiline"), was ready to concede that the farmer was generally virtuous while the tradesman was generally dishonest. Moreover, though their lives were more complex than those of their following, both Jefferson and Calhoun had assiduously cultivated simplicity as the high road to perfection; and their religious tolerance was acceptable to the backwoods Calvinists since they were not attacking the latter's religion, even though the backwoods men, if they should ever have the opportunity, would not hesitate to write their own tenets into the organic law. Nationalism was not an issue for the reason that the nation to the backwoods men was the State, thus bringing their nationalist views into more or less coincidence with their

leaders' particularist views. Calhoun's and Jefferson's dislike of war was abstract: their common open dislike for England (Jefferson's lingering from the Revolution, Calhoun's from a hereditary personal bitterness, his grandmother having been slain and a young female cousin abducted by Indians instigated by British agents, and an uncle having been murdered by a Tory) expressed concretely the sentiment of current belligerency.

Nor was the distinction between the aristocracy and common people so sharply drawn as to cause general resentment. Democracy was the common people's ideology: aristocrats like Jefferson had not originated the doctrine, but only given articulation and form to it. The aristocracy had risked so much for democracy, even after the Revolution having attempted to dispossess themselves for the people, that they must believe in it. Moreover, did not the sons of the wealthy planters frequently follow the plough with the slaves? Were not the great families always ready to receive in marriage the talented sons of the people in that process of recruitment and execration normal to healthy aristocracies? If the gate of opportunity was open to all, it mattered little whether the shutters of seclusion were afterward closed. Simple people believing in the divine truth of the equality of human souls, they were not too prone to question the differentiations – a nobility of men of action and a priesthood of men of thought – springing from the matrix of the soil in which they themselves were rooted, and fundamentally the aims and sympathies of the aristocracy and people were the same. For what was the aristocracy's logic but a derivation from the realities the simple-minded eternally contemplated? What was the aristocracy's honour and courage but the intolerant code of the innocent? What was the aristocracy's grace but an imitation of the compassion of the humble? What was the aristocracy's hospitality but a shadow of that perfect charity practiced by the poor? And where did the aristocracy find its fulfillment but in the point of departure still

occupied by the common people? Humanity in that natural order had no hunger for equality but only for justice. The weak expected, and had a right to demand, the protection of the strong. Such a natural condition of society the people, attuned to reality, and the aristocracy, trained in logic derived from reality, could both accept, the former knowing that the problem of reconciling liberty with inequality pertained to men of reason; the latter knowing that the higher a man the greater his obligations, and that he must, therefore, seek liberty not for himself but for the weaker. Such was the simple but workable theory upon which the Southern democracy was organized, whereby an ordered and self-disciplined ruling class whose pride was above mere will-to-power and whose code of honour (protected by manners) was superior to the positive law, could, as a minority, live and act in defence of statecraft and liberty and serve as a brake against the anarchy of unrestrained democracy. . . Nor did the people fear that such an aristocracy would become a too-rigid organism, excentric and fatuous by its own excesses; for should it so misjudge its environment as to put heredity above training, self-interest above class, and class above principle, it would destroy itself or become so decadent it might be easily annihilated.

II

CALHOUN like Jefferson had a decided distaste for the legal practice, a profession that, supporting itself by the indiscriminate defence of right and wrong, generally lessened regard for those distinctions. His first taste of public life had encouraged him to give up law to enter politics; and a year after his defence of President Jefferson saw him nominated for the House of Representatives of the South Carolina Legislature. He was unanimously elected – the best proof of the high regard in which he was held by his constituency, the legal profession being at the time so unpopular that no member of it had been sent to the Legislature in many years.

The Legislature met on November 28, 1808. It was an important period in the history of South Carolina, when a compromise to compose the quarrel between the upper-country and the lower-country populations (similar to the struggle between the western Qu'hees and the Tidewater Tuckahoes that had occupied Jefferson in Virginia) was being agitated. The lower or eastern part of the State had gained its power when the upper-country was a wilderness, and for a long time refused to admit the increasing population of the new region to a representative share of the State government; but at the final session of the preceding Legislature a compromise had been reached, subsequently advertised in accordance with the requirements, and was now to come up for passage before the newly chosen body.

Here was a simple problem in the first essential of democratic government listed by Mr. Jefferson—an "absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority . . . from which there is no appeal but to force." Calhoun remembered his father's story of how he had once gone down with his neighbours to within twenty miles of Charleston, armed with rifles, to exercise a right of suffrage which had been disputed—a rebellion that had ended in his father's going to the State Legislature where he had served his section for thirty years. In those days reliance on virtue, reason and courage constituted the true moral strength of a man. "When wrongs are pressed because it is believed they will be borne, resistance becomes morality," was one of Jefferson's axioms; and Calhoun's father had believed that implicitly.

Yet the conditions under which they lived, father and son, were to be so vastly different. Patrick Calhoun, like the young Jefferson, had known only an agrarian society in which the propertied people were land-holders, and the franchise, extending only to these, included less than one-fifteenth of the population, so that the ideal of political democracy was the simple economic democracy of opportunity to own land, and the *free* franchise was generally regarded as a question-

able device whereby wily politicians might exploit the people. Under such conditions, the Charleston clique could be regarded as the spokesmen for the *majority*, and the upper-country men (by the property qualification of the franchise) a minority; and the latter were those whom Jefferson had in mind when he said that "the minority rights call for rights which equal laws must protect." This was the substances of the Fathers devising a system of government so weak that the minorities would be relatively strong. Such minority rights the lower-country men were ready and willing to accord to the upper-country; but equal numerical representation meant transferring the majority-power to the more populous west so that the older and wealthier east would become the minority.

The younger Calhoun was beginning his career in a century of world-wide expansion when populations for some unknown reason were increasing in unprecedented numbers, making of progress a mass movement in which the people were demanding their "rights" based upon the individualistic aspect of democracy, levelling by its sheer inertia all phases of life—not only political, but social, religious and economic—and paving the way for the revolutionary doctrine that made man the crowning glory of creation, to the consternation of a self-conscious aristocracy that believed evolution to be cataclysmic., Already the Jeffersonian agrarian commonwealth was beginning to disappear: bursting, after expanding to its allotted proportions, into industrial components, forcing inventions (both mechanical and intellectual) to provide for the necessities of rapid expansion and the unbridled greed of competition; building factories and centring great populations around them; taking art, religion and science for granted, while scorning the past from which these amenities had arisen, and making of government an industry of licentiousness instead of liberty. . .

With his friends Langdon Cheves, then in the Legislature, and William Lowndes, who had been in the previous Legis-

lature (with both of whom he was to be subsequently more closely associated at Washington), Calhoun must have had many spirited discussions upon the subject, for later there was a marked concurrence in their views. Though recognizing the currents at work in the world, his was not the type of mind to accept evolution as automatic and invincible, but rather as a force to be defined logically and assisted or combated with the will. Pure democracy and the rights of minorities he believed in as implicitly as his father or Mr. Jefferson, but contradictions necessarily crept in with evolution. Popular democracy, the unchecked control of a mere numerical majority, must end in reversing, by its cycle, the whole progress of democracy, especially in an enormous and diversified territory peopled by a vast population. Under such conditions a nationwide presidential primary would be political madness; a majority vote with power to recall a judicial decision or to perform any governmental act would result in haphazard or blind tyranny.

But though a mere numerical majority was blind tyranny, the majority could not surrender its power to minorities: that would not be democracy. The rights of minorities called for toleration, not equal rights; and, as a matter of fact, the whole course of history proved that minorities (especially combined minorities) tended to coerce the majority rather than the reverse. Moreover, the logic of minority liberty was individual liberty (an obstacle even Jefferson had stumbled over), and individual liberty in the hands of materialists was a dangerous doctrine.

Eliminating the tyranny of both a blind numerical majority and organized minorities, what was left? Obviously the Constitution with its many checks and balances, the established and inherited system of *progressive* democracy established by the wise Fathers of the Republic, with not one majority but many majorities—as many as there were small restricted States in the Union. A true *democratic majority* was the aggregate of smaller concurring majorities, just as a

true democratic union was made up of small concurring nations. This was arbitrarily setting a limitation upon the region in which liberty could be accorded to the fullest; but it was the only safeguard against despotism, either national, sectional or individual. By its application the upper-State may have been swept into the Union against its will by the majority vote of South Carolina; but the South could never be swept into an industrial nation against its will by a majority vote of the Union. . .

THE bill granting the upper section of the State a preponderance in the House of Representatives while the lower-country retained control of the Senate, was finally passed. Calhoun highly commended the action of the latter section in giving up its rights under the Constitution as well as that of the upper-country in yielding the complete control that would come to it from a government based on numbers only, and justified his opinion by his theory of concurrent majorities.

Except in one instance, Calhoun's chief claim to distinction during his terms in the State Legislature was in his complete independence. Joseph Alston of Charleston, the husband of Aaron Burr's beautiful daughter Theodosia, declared, after seeking in vain to bring Calhoun into his clique: "I am afraid I shall find this long, gawky fellow from Abbeville hard to manage."

The exceptional instance was on the occasion when a formal meeting of the democratic portion of the members was called to nominate candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. The great Jefferson, the former idol of the people, was going out of office to the hoots and jeers of the fickle populace no less than had his federalistic predecessors, Washington and Adams. The conservatives thought him too radical; the radicals declared he was growing conservative with age. Between two fires he had attempted to compromise by an aggressive restrictive system and a pacifist

attitude towards war, with the result that he had pleased neither side. In New England where conservatism was closely allied with the shipping interests, either extreme of the compromise was equally distasteful. In the South some of the older aristocracy had never quite been able to banish the earlier general suspicion of their class for Jefferson because of his determination to dispossess them; and even some of the older Jeffersonian Democrats like Nathaniel Macon and John Taylor feared war because its flames of nationalism would imperil the new and tender growth of republicanism.

But as a matter of fact Jefferson's radical Democratic Party of 1800 was showing signs already of becoming conservative, both from the natural tendency of human organizations (like human beings) to crystallization, and from the leaven which the conservatives, who had been brought into the fold of the Democratic Party by the repudiation of the Federalist Party, were exerting upon the whole lump. (From this standpoint the complete smashing of the Federalist Party, which might have provided a permanent refuge for the temperamentally conservative, was the worst thing that could have happened so far as the Democratic Party was concerned.) Now the conservatives saw an opportunity to regain control through the Democratic Party itself. They began to advertise the fact that the party was not really radical after all. Was not Jefferson himself a propertied man, rich in slaves (by which wealth was then measured in the South), and aristocratic in spirit and mode of life? Did he not entertain lavishly at *Monticello?* How did his palace at Washington, with its dozen servants, French cooks and stewards, Irish coachmen, and slaves, and its profusion of flowers and birds, contrast with the washing of Dame Adams (the first lady of the last Federalist administration) which had formerly hung in the East Room? James Madison, Jefferson's friend and own choice of his successor, was a conservative, a former Federalist: the property interests of the country would be safe under his administration.

But the radicals, though resenting the growing conservatism of their party, were not disposed to repudiate either their great leader or their party. Jefferson was growing old – even Patrick Henry had become one of the worst reactionaries in Virginia before his death – and could be retired; and as for the party, it was theirs and right in principle, and only needed to be purged of alien conservatism. The radicals would vote for Madison also, and then put up their fight for the control of the party – or, for the control of the country since there was only the one political party: if they won, their triumph would express in war (as Jefferson had failed to do) the spirit of the new nationalism.

Madison was, therefore, nominated for the Presidency without opposition. When the nomination for the Vice-Presidency was presented, Calhoun proceeded to present his opinion in reference to coming events as bearing on the nomination. He reviewed the state of relations between the United States and Great Britain and France, the two great belligerents then struggling for the mastery of Europe, and in their struggle trampling on the rights of neutrals, especially those of America. He touched on the restrictive system (whose efficacy he doubted) which Jefferson had resorted to in order to protect American rights and his conviction that a war with Great Britain would be unavoidable. "It is in this state of things of the utmost importance that the ranks of the Democratic Party should be preserved undisturbed and unbroken by faction or discord." He then disclosed that a discontented faction of the party had given evidence of rallying around the name of the venerable Vice-President, George Clinton (whose renomination was proposed), of whom he spoke highly; but gave it as his opinion that should such an eminent man as Clinton be renominated he would become the nucleus of all the discontented portion of the party and thus make a formidable division in its ranks should the country be forced into war. These persons, he predicted, would ultimately rally around De Witt Clinton, the nephew, whom he

described as a man of distinguished talents but aspiring disposition. To avoid the danger, he suggested the name of John Langdon of New Hampshire, for whose talents and patriotism he had a high regard.

Langdon was nominated, due to Calhoun's exertions; and subsequent events were to prove the latter's keen insight into coming events and endow him with the prophetic attribute which, excepting divine revelation, is no more or less than a wide mental grasp which few men can share.

Such an attitude as Calhoun's towards democracy and war could not but fail to win him the approbation of his section; and in the Spring of 1810 he was nominated for the House of Representatives in the Twelfth Congress convening in November, 1811, in pursuance to the President's call. His district was composed of Abbeville, Laurence and Newberry, and his cousin, James Calhoun, who had represented the district in the two preceding congresses, willingly retired in his young kinsman's favor. His opponent, General James A. Elmore, had been nominated by those timid souls who, remembering the awful days when "Tarleton's red dragoons had ridden over the State," dreaded another war. The opposition was only nominal; and in October the strongly Federalist Charleston *Courier* reported that there was "no doubt of the election of this gentleman."

III

MEANTIME, Calhoun had been corresponding with Mrs. Floride Colhoun, of Charleston and Newport, to press his suit for the hand of her daughter, Floride — his second cousin, and ten years his junior. Floride's father being dead, the proprieties of the time demanded that he first address her mother. "I have a strong inclination to lay open my intention to the object of my affection by letter," he had written on one occasion, "and if this meets with your approbation as proper, nothing will prevent me from doing so."

It was a promising future that was unfolding before him. He was just twenty-eight. He had won the regard of his community, and spent two profitable years in the State Legislature. He had just been triumphantly elected to Congress. Now he was to win the hand of the beautiful girl with whom he had fallen in love . . . who at the same time fortunately had wealth and social position.

Not that his own family lacked eminence and means. His father, Patrick Calhoun, had been one of four brothers who, with their mother and sister, had emigrated to Virginia from County Donegal, Northern Ireland, in 1727. (The Calhouns were of Scotch extraction—the name originally having been Colquhoun—and connected with the Earl of Lexon, in Dumbartonshire, Scotland.) After the crushing defeat of Braddock near Fort Duquesne in 1755, the family had pushed on to South Carolina (where the Governor had made a satisfactory peace with the Cherokees) and settled on the Long Canes Creek, eight miles from Abbeville. Here, despite numerous Indian attacks in which his grandmother and one uncle had been murdered, and two female cousins taken captive (one of whom was never found), and the depredations of the British and Tories, the Calhouns had prospered, acquired land and slaves, and won considerable eminence in their section. His uncles had served with distinction in the Revolution; his cousin was the wife of General Andrew Pickens, and his father had been in the General Assembly and Legislature some thirty years before his death in 1796. Calhoun was the son of his father's second marriage to Martha Caldwell whose family was derived from Virginia Huguenots and Lowlanders from the Firth of Solway. Thus in his veins coursed the blood of Ireland, of Scotland and of France; and if in appearance he had inherited the beauty of the Irish, his mind was characteristic rather of the Scotch love of order and rectitude and the French love of liberty and logic.

His birth, therefore, as well as his spirit and cultivation,

made him welcome to the highest society of the State; but marriage to the daughter of Floride Bonneau, a member of the old and wealthy seaboard aristocracy, would make him a member of that charmed circle. . .

In November his future mother-in-law came home from Newport by water. Calhoun met the packet in Charleston and went with the family to their plantation at Bonneau's Ferry on the Cooper River to spend the holidays and discuss arrangements for his wedding the coming January.

Many of the upper-country homes were pretentious, but here on the seaboard the mansions were truly magnificent, comparing favourably with the great English baronial houses of the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Generally the older homes were Georgian, built at a time when that style was not only the language of aristocracy but a symbol of Tory faith; when gentlemen, equipped with Campbell's *Vitruvius Britannicus*, the four-folio volumes of Leoni's *Palladio*, and the *Builders' Dictionary or Gentleman's Companion*, were their own architects; while the newer places, like Mr. Jefferson's *Monticello*, showed the classical influence of the Revolution.

Like most old houses that remain the home of one family through successive generations, the furnishings represented an accretion of tastes rather than any definite mode of interior decoration, style to cultivated people being the servant and never the master of taste. Drawing-rooms were generally panelled with gilded moulding and papered (artists not being readily obtainable at the time to decorate them) in the French taste after the Châteaux Style; paintings were family portraits by Stuart and Peale, or French and English miniatures; the chandeliers were French bronze and crystal; the mirrors Adam or Chippendale, with raised gold-leafed designs; the furniture Heppelwhite and Chippendale from England and the more ornate Bourbon pieces from France, while the modern note was struck by the elegant new chairs from Seddons,

London, their lozenge and lyre backs festooned with crimson and yellow silk to match the draperies and expensive Moore carpets, and the austerely simple Directoire sofas and tables and Aubussons and Savonneries rugs.

The lands of the plantations were no less imposing, the acreage being counted by the thousand, while such trifles as lawns and rose-gardens were measured by the acre. The maintenance of such estates necessarily depended on chattel-labour, and these slaves were counted by the hundred, their quarters being a "village" in itself with named streets along which were ranged the cabins constructed of stone or cypress logs and mortar reinforced with hog hairs, each with its small back garden, pigsty and hen-house where the family might raise its own food or produce and products for sale.

Near the Big House, where the mistress could conveniently supervise them, were the house-servants' quarters; the great out-kitchen with its roaring fireplace and lofty reredos hung with shining copper; the hot-houses and gardens; the fowl-yard with its assortment of guineas, ducks, peacocks, turkeys, geese and chickens; the kennels of the pack, the fox hounds, Irish setters, black pointers, and water spaniels; the cool, airy dairy with its deep troughs of running water in which were immersed the cans of milk; the smoke-house with its hundreds of russet hams cured with corncob and green hickory smoking; the flour, grocery and coffee houses; the weaving-rooms, noisy with the hum of loom and spinning-wheel and the singing of shuttles; the dyeing rooms where the finished clothes were coloured a brownish gray with the bark of red oak, poplar and dogwood "fixed" by copperas and alum, and a turkey-red trimming (so dear to the Negro heart) coloured with cochineal.

Forming another group by themselves were the store-houses: the provision or pork-house where the slaves drew their fortnightly supplies – pork, cornmeal, rice, potatoes, sorghum, tobacco-twist, stocking cotton and wool, and (if it was time) a suit of clothes, a pair of shoes, blankets, a wool

or straw hat, brogans, and overcoat; the saddle-shop where bridles and saddles were mended and shoes half-soled; the carriage-shed with its assortment of wagons, sulkies, buggies, and the fine family carriage upholstered in silk, with silver trimmings and silver-plated harness to match; the carpenter, blacksmith and wheelwright shops; the key-room where the overseer kept all the keys of the plantation; the hoe-house where the field implements were stored; store-rooms for shoes, blankets, hats, and other clothing; the saddle-room where the bridles and saddles were kept; the grain and forage house for storing the forage and fodder; and finally the great gin-house with its modern cotton screw for compressing and baling the staple.

Near the wharf — for the planter was his own merchant and broker and shipped his rice and cotton and naval stores direct to buyers in Europe and the North — was a long row of pumps and troughs on one side of which was the stable and on the other the stock-yards. In the stable were quartered the working mules, the wagon or work horses, the carriage and saddle horses, the stallions and fillies. In the stock-yards were herded the hundreds of swine and cattle.

The proprietor's sources of income were the great rice and cotton fields, and the turpentine orchards (generally cultivated by white tenants on crop-shares) where the cutters worked all winter expertly notching with their sharp axes the boxes in which the sluggish fluid of the pine-trees gathered. The limited crops — principally corn, sweet potatoes and blackeyed peas — provided food for the slaves and forage and fodder for the animals. The table of the Big House, supplied from the kitchen gardens, fruit orchards, vineyards, berry patches, fowl and stock-yards, was abundantly supplemented by wild game and sea food (which the slaves frequently shared by permission or stealth): venison, bear, 'possum, rabbit and squirrel from the forest; rice-bird, blue-winged teal, wild goose and turkey, quail, blackhead and canvas-back duck, from the marshes; mallet, trout, flounder,

shell-fish, oyster, clam, shrimp, scallop and turtle from the Sound. The degree in which the plantation-community was self-contained and self-supporting was the measure of success; and since independence was inseparable from liberty, the plantation system was the very font of libertarian doctrines whose language bespoke the collective body's, as well as the individual's, mastership of time and actions, and in which there were no elements of envy and hunger – and death.

IV

AFTER his marriage, which was "celebrated with old-time pomp" at Bonneau Plantation, Calhoun purchased a small estate on Bath Ridge, between the Savannah and Little Rivers, not far from the original Calhoun settlement. He had refused "from prejudice or reason" any marriage settlement. "That entire confidence which is reposed by a female in the object of her choice in placing both her honour and her property in his custody, give rise to the most sacred and tender regard," he had written Mrs. Colhoun. But a marriage settlement implied a distrust. . . It was his intention to support his wife by his own means, and evidently his bride made no objection to a less ostentatious style of living than she had been accustomed to.

But the young couple were not to remain long at Bath. May saw them in Charleston, taking in the theatre and the balls and the final post-Lenten events; September found him at the State capital, Columbia, attending to business affairs; and soon thereafter he was journeying to Washington – alone, since his wife was pregnant and could not accompany him. In those days the trip occupied from ten days to three weeks by land, it being necessary to cross many rivers, swollen by rains at this season, on flat-boats poled by Negroes. No doubt he spent the time profitably, carefully charting his future course at the federal Capital.

What should be his policy? – what his power? Or, prac-

tically put, what should be his politics? He was still young enough to believe that real political issues could neither be manufactured nor evaded; and having a concise idea of the issue, he was determined to meet it squarely. His own stand was perfectly clear (no one was ever able to charge him with ambiguity): first, upon the principles that had brought the Democratic Party into power in 1801, and second, upon the defence of the national honour. In his own mind, war with England was now inevitable, Lord Castlereagh, British Minister for Foreign Affairs, having categorically declared that Napoleon's Berlin and Milan Decrees must be repealed singly and specially in relation to all other neutrals as well as the United States before his government would pledge itself to repeal its orders-in-council—or in other words, that the United States' rights as a neutral nation depended upon whether we could induce France to regard the rights of other neutral nations. England, foreseeing that America must eventually come in on the side of France, would, therefore, intensify impressments in order to decimate the American Navy before the conflict began. It was a matter of common knowledge, too, that Lord Dorchester, Governor of Canada, was negotiating with the Council of the Tribes for a generous bounty to the Indians for American scalps.

The general impression that Calhoun began his career in a spirit of broad nationalism and closed it in a spirit of narrow sectionalism was based upon a number of fallacies. In the first place, Calhoun's intellect was touched with genius which is always proportionate to its independence of time and place; so that if he expressed his impressions in round phrases at different times, they must be fitted together to reveal the true mosaic of his brilliant mind. The second fallacy was in the modern-minded association of nationalism with war: Calhoun's "nationalism" was a broad Unionism which died in the War between the States; his sentiment for war a patriotic answer to England's arrogance as well as to the urgent demands of his immediate constituency restive

under the restraints of the older conservative generation. And if at the beginning of his career he did not speak for the timid slave-holding interests of his State, the reason was that it was the upper-country people who had sent him to Congress.

Nor could his early ideology be separated from the practical sectional aspects of his stand. The material losses due to a war would be heaviest in New England where the shipping interests expected to reap a rich harvest from neutrality (provided the restrictions were withdrawn). As Hayne later declared, "The fact that from the commencement of the French Revolution to the fall of Napoleon the United States occupied a neutral position and enjoyed the privilege of monopolizing the carrying trade and commanding for her breadstuffs the markets of the world, would sufficiently account not only for the rapid growth and extraordinary prosperity of our country, but also for the temporary depression which must result from the loss of these advantages. Our fields have almost literally been fertilized by the blood of Europe. We have fattened on the crimes of her tyrants and the sufferings of her people." The West, where expansion had been curtailed by England's having left an important part of the Treaty of 1783 unfulfilled by her failure to surrender important military posts and by arming the Indians and retaining Chiefs on her pension roll, had visions of acquiring by a successful war unlimited farm lands (perhaps even Canada) for her farmers and cornering the fur trade for her traders by putting an end to the Indian menace in the Northwest Territory. And since the West could not look to New England for assistance, she looked to the South.

Thus the remote, if not the immediate, advantages to be derived from war would be considerable for the South, for Calhoun's State, and for his own section. An alliance between the South and West would dominate the Union, and the South would dominate the alliance. Cuba and eastern Florida belonged to Spain, but these countries were becoming

more and more dependent on England, and an American victory would practically remove the last obstacle to procuring them as Southern States. In the South the leading State was destined to be South Carolina, for already Virginia was falling to second place in importance, her exports in 1810 having been only four and a half millions as compared with South Carolina's (nearly) eleven million. In the latter State, tobacco had given way to cotton, and most of the past year's exports of more than fifteen millions had come from the upper-country which Calhoun represented. Thus, the very existence of the Virginia Dynasty depended on the good-will of the Palmetto State (and perhaps Kentucky), so that Madison would have no choice but to defend the new patriotism or yield the leadership that had come to him from Jefferson.

The key to Calhoun's early career is thus recognizable as the key to his whole career. He has an uncanny power to analyze complicated circumstances and show what are the underlying and controlling factors hidden in the tangle. He is an ardent patriot: he sees the needs of a great and expanding country, and like his acknowledged mentor, Jefferson, is willing to sacrifice his understanding of his own powers to make room for the future. He dreads an alliance between New England and the West which would give them control of the Union and the Federalists a new lease of political power, and is willing to sacrifice immediate material interests for a rejuvenated South-West party . . . with himself in the governing element of that party.

II. THE MILLENNIUM

Popular Democracy [1812-1840]

The Revolution of 1828

Calhoun and Jackson

"Hearest thou," he said, "the wild acclaim
"With which they shout the Douglas's name?
"With like acclaim the vulgar throat
"Strained for King James the morning note;
"With like acclaim they hailed the day
"When first I broke the Douglas's sway;
"And like acclaim would Douglas greet
"If he could hurl me from my seat!"

Scott

I

In 1811 Washington was still an "Embryo capital

> . . . where fancy sees
> Squares in morasses, obelisks in trees,
> Which second-sighted seers, e'en new, adorn
> With shrines unbuilt, and heroes yet unborn,
> Though naught but woods and Jefferson they see
> Where streets should run and sages ought to be!"

as the Irish poet, Thomas Moore, had written a few years before; only now Jefferson was home at *Monticello* and James Madison was down from *Montpelier* to steer the ship of state through the troubled waters of neutrality. Symbolizing the growth of the Republic, the Capitol building was rising rapidly under the direction of Latrobe who had completed for the House the most beautiful legislative hall in the world, a less beautiful chamber for the Senate, and had found a small place for the Supreme Court in the lower hall.

Madison at the time was past sixty, a modest and shy little man whom his friends called "Father" and his detractors "Poor Jemmy." Devoid of all pretentiousness, the President acted and dressed simply, usually in American-made clothes the material of which was made from American-grown wool. He was, however, a capable student of government with a keen insight and understanding of any situation he confronted; and what he lacked in glamour was more than made up for by his beautiful and vivacious North Carolinian wife who had been the widow of a Philadelphia lawyer. The older people never having grasped the new etiquette still referred to the President as "His Majesty" and to his lady

as "Her Majesty"; and certainly no queen ever appeared more regal than did Dolly Madison in her gowns of rich satins trimmed with lace and embroidered with silver or gold threads (cut in the Récamier style made famous by the ladies of the French Emperor's Court, with the waist-line obscured and the bodice shortened to barely an inch), with gleaming pearls upon her bare neck and high white plumes or a gorgeous turban upon her curled hair. Reaction had swept away that part of Jeffersonian simplicity which was mere simon-purity: democratic principles were all very well, but it was important to impress foreign nations with the proper court etiquette, decreed the ceremonialists. So the presidential levees had resumed their splendour, and the conversation its vivacity and smartness: about the music of Beethoven; the poetry of a brilliant young Englishman named Byron; the striking similarity of Walter Scott's works to those of a Philadelphian, Philip Freneau; a new and amusing *Knickerbocker's History of New York* by Washington Irving, a gifted young native of that city; Fulton's *Clermont* which had appeared two years before, and the regular steamboat service between such remote points as Pittsburgh and New Orleans, and the wonderful possibilities of James Watts' condensing steam-engine which, some bold spirits declared, brought even steam coaches within the realm of inventive possibility. Shop talk, of course, all centred around the war which most statesmen now agreed could not be avoided even if the President should abandon the restrictive system. In the meantime Madison, who was eligible for re-election the following year, would probably continue Jefferson's embargo policy until the country was more solidly behind him. . .

On November 6 Calhoun took his seat in the federal councils where he was to remain the better part of the next forty years. In the House was a brilliant galaxy of young men from the South and new Southwest—Calhoun, Cheves and Lowndes from South Carolina, Felix Grundy from Tennessee, and

Henry Clay from Kentucky. Of them, Clay had served a few years in the Senate (having relinquished his seat to become Speaker, so it was said, to curb the erratic John Randolph of Roanoke who was so bitingly and effectively attacking the war policy), and Cheves had served a part of the preceding term in the House; but the others were all new and inexperienced. Nathaniel Macon of North Carolina, Randolph's friend and fellow anti-Yazooist, was in the House, and William H. Crawford of Georgia was in the Senate. Webster had not yet arrived in Washington, being still engaged at Rockingham in fulminating against the federal Government.

On the very first ballot Clay – but five years older than Calhoun – was elected Speaker by seventy-five votes against thirty-eight for Bibb of Georgia and three for Macon of North Carolina, the two peace candidates. Clay, sensing Calhoun's particular talent, immediately put him on the committee on foreign relations where he subsequently held first place upon the chairman's withdrawal from Congress. Grundy was on the committee with him. Cheves was chairman of the committee on naval affairs. In the House, at any rate, there was no doubt as to the future course the Union would follow. The President's message had been warlike; and though the young War Hawks were unable to include in the naval bill an authorization to build ten new frigates and to organize the militia upon a uniform plan, some of the old war-ships were ordered renovated, and measures were passed to fill the existing regiments and raise additional regulars.

Calhoun's maiden effort was on December 12 when he answered the fiery Randolph's opposition speech on the Apportionment Bill. The test was a difficult one, but he met it, according to the Richmond *Enquirer*, like "a master spirit who stamps his name upon the age in which he lives . . . felling down the errors of his opponents with the club of Hercules."

"Sir," he said in part, "I might prove the war, should it ensue, justifiable by the express admissions of the gentleman

from Virginia; and necessary by facts undoubted and universally admitted such as that gentleman did not pretend to controvert. The extent, duration and character of the injuries received; the failure of those peaceful means heretofore resorted to for the redress of our wrongs, is my proof that it is necessary. Why should I mention the impressment of our seamen; depredation on every branch of commerce, including the direct export trade, continued for years, and made under laws which professedly undertake to regulate our trade with other nations; negotiation resorted to time after time till it is become hopeless; the restrictive system persisted in to avoid war, and in the vain expectation of returning justice? The evil still grows. . .

"The first argument of the gentleman which I shall notice is the unprepared state of the country. Whatever weight this argument might have in a question of immediate war, it surely has little in that of preparation for it. If our country is unprepared, let us remedy the evil as soon as possible. . .

"I believe it was said that the nation will not pay taxes because the rights violated are not worth defending, or that the defence will cost more than the profit. Sir, I here enter my most solemn protest against this low and *calculating avarice* entering this hall of legislation. It is only fit for shops and counting-houses, and ought not to disgrace the seat of sovereignty by its squalid and vile appearance. *Whenever it touches a sovereign power, the nation is ruined.* It is too short-sighted to defend itself. It is an unpromising spirit, always ready to yield a part to save the balance. . .

"Sir, I know only one principle to make a nation great, to produce in this country not the form but the real spirit of union, and that is to protect every citizen in the rightful pursuit of his business. He will then feel he is backed by the Government; that its arm is his arm. . . Protection and patriotism are reciprocal. This is the road that all great nations have trod. Sir, I am not versed in the calculating policy, and will not, therefore, pretend to estimate in dollars and cents

the value of national independence, or national affection. I cannot dare to measure, in shillings and pence, the misery, the stripes, and the slavery of impressed seamen; not even to value our shipping, commercial and agricultural losses, under the orders-in-council and the British system of blockade. . .

"The gentleman from Virginia attributes preparation for war to everything but its true cause. He endeavoured to find it in the probable rise of hemp. He represents the people of the Western States as willing to plunge the whole country into war for such base and precarious motives. I will not reason on this point. I see the cause of their ardour, not in such base motives but in their known patriotism and disinterestedness. No less mercenary is the reason which he attributes to the Southern States. He says that the non-importation has reduced cotton to nothing which has produced a feverish impatience. Sir, I acknowledge that the cotton of our farms is worth but little, but not for the cause assigned by the gentleman from Virginia. The people of that section do not reason as he does; they do not attribute it to the efforts of their Government to maintain the peace and independence of their country; they see in the low price of the produce the hand of foreign injustice; they know well, without the market to the Continent, the deep and steady current of supply will glut that of Great Britain; they are not prepared for the colonial state to which again that Power is attempting to reduce us. The manly spirit of that section of our country will not submit to be regulated by any foreign power. . ."

After this spirited speech Calhoun was enthusiastically greeted by the great body of his Party, and thenceforward took his place in the ranks of the country's leaders. . .

In May Randolph began to complain that he was disturbed by rumours of an impending declaration of war, but Clay succeeded in putting him off on the ground that since war had

not been declared he was out of order in debating it. In the meantime, Clay and a committee called on President Madison to assure him that the House was ready. This was what Madison had been waiting for.

On June 1, which came on Monday in that year of 1812, a confidential message was received from the President. The House was cleared and the note read in secret session. The message reviewed the course of England and declared that she was in reality already maintaining a state of war against the United States. "Whether the United States shall continue passive under these progressive usurpations . . . or, opposing force by force in defence of their national rights, shall commit a just cause into the hands of the Almighty Dispenser of events . . . is a solemn question which the Constitution wisely confides to the legislative department of the Government. In recommending it to their early deliberation, I am happy in the assurance that the decision will be worthy of the enlightened and patriotic councils of a virtuous, a free, and a powerful nation."

The President's message was immediately referred to the committee on foreign affairs, and two days later Calhoun made his momentous report (probably written by Monroe) reviewing the long series of wrongs suffered by the United States at the hand of England, and concluding: "Your Committee recommend an immediate appeal to arms." The bill declaring war against England was passed by 79 votes to 49. On June 18 the Senate notified the House that it had passed the bill with certain amendments which were concurred in by the House, and the completed bill was at once signed by President Madison. On that same day the injunction of secrecy as to the message and proceeding was removed upon the motion of Calhoun. The Washington *National Intelligencer* and the Richmond *Enquirer* boldly took up the defence of the war.

At last the die was cast, and the new American federation, with its population of less than eight million, with a pitiful

sea-going Navy (reduced by Jefferson at the time he established West Point) consisting of three large frigates known as "Forty-Fours," four smaller frigates rated at from thirty-two to thirty-eight guns each, and a number of sloops-of-war and brigs mounting sixteen to eighteen guns, or a little more than a dozen vessels in all, was at war with the most fundamentally powerful nation on earth which alone had been able to stand up against the colossal empire of Napoleon, and whose ships (there were approximately a thousand on the British Naval List) had swept the seas of all enemies . . . an implacable foe, puffed up with the arrogance of success, who with the stupendous backing of a people smugly regarding themselves as the saviours of the world, had actually fought seven wars in the past century and a quarter to determine whether the world should be led by English nationalism or French cosmopolitanism, had massacred a hundred and fifty thousand Irish in the Rebellion of 1798, and who despised her late American colonies as mere pesky wasps deserving of annihilation because they would not otherwise be saved by neutrality.

Actually, had the cable then existed Jefferson's restrictive policy would have prevented war, the British orders-in-council having been repealed on June 17, the day before war was declared. But not knowing this, and being as positive that the embargo system had not prevented war as they were particularly anxious to placate New England where the anti-war sentiment was strong, Calhoun and some of his party tried to lighten the prohibitory acts; and to this end Cheves introduced into the House from the ways-and-means committee a bill partially suspending them for a limited time, which Richardson of Massachusetts moved to amend by repealing all the prohibitory acts entirely. Calhoun's warm support of the amendment may be taken as evidence of his complete independence of party on questions of principle, the restrictive system having long been the main test of party fidelity, and party spirit never having been higher than it

was at the time – as the defeat of the bill, as well as the amendment, subsequently revealed.

"I am in favour of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts," Calhoun declared on June 24, "and as I differ from many of my friends on the subject, I feel it a duty to present the reasons which govern me. . . The restrictive system, as a means of resistance and a mode of obtaining redress for our wrongs, has never been a favourite one with me. . . But though I do not think the embargo a wise measure, yet I am far from thinking it a pusillanimous one. To lock up the whole commerce of the country; to say to the most trading and exporting people in the world, You shall not trade, You shall not export; to break in on the schemes of almost every man in society, is far from weakness, very far from pusillanimity. Sir, I confess while I disapprove that more than any measure, it proves the strength of your Government and the patriotism of the people. The arm of despotism under similar circumstances could not coerce its execution more effectually than the zeal and patriotism of the people. But, sir, I object to the restrictive system . . . because it does not suit the genius of our people or that of the Government, or the geographical character of our country. We are a people essentially active. I may say we are pre-eminently so. Distance and difficulties are less to us than any people on earth. . . No passive system can suit such a people, in action superior to all others, in patience and endurance inferior to many. Nor does it suit the genius of our Government. Our Government is founded on freedom and hates coercion. To make the coercive system effectual requires the most arbitrary laws. . .

"Besides, there are other and strong objections to the system. It renders Government odious. People are not in the habit of looking back beyond the immediate cause. The farmer inquires why he cannot get more for his produce, and he is told that it is owing to the embargo, or to commercial restrictions. In this he sees only the hand of his own Govern-

ment. He does not look at those acts of violence and injustice which this system is intended to counteract. His censures fall on the Government. . .

"In war it is different. The privation, it is true, may be equal or greater; but the public mind, under the strong impulses of that state of things, becomes steeled against sufferings. The difference is great between the passive and active state of mind. Tie down a hero and he feels the puncture of a pin; throw him into battle and he is scarcely sensible to vital gashes. So in war; impelled alternately by hope and fear, stimulated with revenge, depressed with shame, or elevated with victory, the people become invincible. No privation can shake their fortitude. No calamity can break their spirit. Even where equally successful, the contrast is striking. War and restriction may leave the country equally exhausted; but the latter not only leaves you poor, but, even when successful, dispirited, divided, discontented, with diminished patriotism and the manners of a considerable portion of your people corrupted.

"Not so in war. In that state the common danger unites all — strengthens the bonds of society, and feeds the flame of patriotism. The national character acquires energy. In exchange for the expenses of war, you obtain military and naval skill, and a more perfect organization of such parts of your Government as are connected with the science of national defence. You also obtain the habit of freely advancing your purse and strength in the common cause.

"Sir, are these advantages to be considered as trifles in the present state of the world? Can they be measured by a moneyed valuation? . . . Sir, I would prefer a single victory over the enemy by sea or land to all the good we shall ever derive from the continuation of the non-importation act. I know not that it would produce an equal pressure on the enemy, but I am certain of what is of greater consequence, that it would be accompanied by more salutary effects on ourselves. The memory of a Saratoga or Eutaw is immortal. It

is there you will find the country's boast and pride, the inexhaustible source of great and heroic actions."

Calhoun probably spoke what his heart desired since his mind could not have failed to see that united patriotism was contingent upon unity of sentiment; for even after the declaration of war the Federalists continued to oppose it through seditious speeches and their press. In Baltimore, a mob attacked the office of the *Federal Republican*, the residence of the editor and other prominent Federalists, and plundered vessels in the harbour. Later, when opposed by Generals Lingan and Lee whom the militia had put in jail for safety, the mob dragged them out and lynched the one and crippled the other for life. In New England where the Federalists saw their commerce, already crippled by the embargoes and the succeeding non-intercourse acts, now threatened with total ruin in contrast to the prosperity it might have enjoyed from neutrality, cries of ill-preparedness and of being tricked by France began to arise. Declared young Daniel Webster in a ringing speech: "We are from principle and habit attached to the Union, but our attachment is to the substance and *not to the form*. . . If the time should ever arrive when this Union shall be held together by nothing but the authority of the law . . . we shall look upon that hour as the closing scene of our country's prosperity. If separation of the States should ever take place, it will be when *one portion* of the country undertakes to control and regulate and sacrifice the interests of *another*."

In the opinion of at least one Federalist that time had already arrived—the Reverend Timothy Dwight of Yale, who walked resolutely into his pulpit and preached a violent secessionist sermon from the text, *Come ye out from among them!*

II

THE first session of the Twelfth Congress adjourned on July 6, 1812, and Calhoun travelled to South Carolina to spend the

summer with his family. There, in the fragrant and enervating Southern warmth, where the tumult had not touched the inner life of the people, the war must have seemed far away. As a matter of fact, during the first two months of hostilities only one action of any importance occurred – when the *President*, the same frigate that a year before had avenged the *Chesapeake* outrage, took several prizes and finally forced the *Alert*, one of the strong convoy of a fleet of British merchantmen from Jamaica, to strike her colours, an action which brought into initial prominence the *President's* young commander, David Porter.

The English press was furious. "The American Navy," stated the London *Evening Star*, "must be annihilated; her arsenals and dockyards consumed. The American merchant-vessels ought perhaps to be permitted to arm against the pirates of the Mediterranean or the Ladrones of China; but like certain places of entertainment they ought to be compelled to exhibit in large letters on their mainsails, *Licensed to carry guns pursuant to a British Act of Parliament.*"

President Madison, a more able theorist and thinker than a man of action, had favoured keeping the insignificant American Navy in port as a guard for the larger harbours; but after the victory of the *President*, he capitulated to the urging of Captains Bainbridge and Stewart and the popular demand that the dozen warships and gunboats comprising the complement be fitted up for offensive sea-duty. At the same time small privateers were rushed in the building for the purpose of running the British blockade and establishing a retaliatory "privateer blockade" of the British Isles. The *Saucy Jack* was first turned out at Charleston, then the *Snap Dragon* at Newbern, North Carolina. These privateers were built in sixteen days, and were a new departure in naval architecture, designed as swift sailers with a few broadside guns. A number carried armament as heavy as a sloop-of-war, making them a match for a sixteen-gun brig. A peculiar feature of the armament was a long gun, usually an eighteen-pounder,

mounted on a swivel so that it could be pointed in any direction. This gun was christened the "Long Tom" in honour of Jefferson who had raised his voice to defend privateer warfare against the British denunciation of it as a form of piracy. For what, demanded Jefferson, could be more merciful in warfare than to punish the enemy by taking their merchandise instead of their lives? And what difference did it make to the loser whether his property was taken by a national or a private armed vessel? "War, whether on land or sea, is constituted by the acts of violence on the persons and property of individuals, and excess of violence is the grand cause that brings about a peace." The English, however, in whose character self-righteousness was so ingrained that it had become a national trait, continued to be indignant that all the world would not play the game by the rules she had herself made . . . to favour herself.

In August the war began in earnest. At the time of its declaration Congress had empowered the President to call for fifty thousand volunteers and use the militia to the extent of a hundred thousand. Major-General Dearborn of Massachusetts was given command of the land forces and instructed to carry the war into the enemy country, thus putting into practice the excellent theory that the aggressor may save valuable home industries by sacrificing the mere lives of a few thousand men. A plan to capture Halifax, a town of fifteen thousand inhabitants and the chief Canadian supply port in winter when Quebec was frozen over, was abandoned as the possibility of any considerable number of Canadians revolting against the mother country appeared less certain. Indeed, even Calhoun was carried away by the general optimism of an easy conquest of Canada. "So far from being unprepared, sir," he declared in Congress, "I believe that in four weeks from the time a declaration of war is heard on our frontier the whole of upper and part of lower Canada will be in our possession."

In the Northwest the Indian situation had been greatly ag-

gravated by Chief Tecumseh's alliance with the Canadian forces (although this alliance was hardly surprising in view of Colonel William Henry Harrison's unjustified attack on the great Indian's forces a few years before), and regarding the conquest of Canada as the only means by which an end could be made of the Indian troubles, the people were eager enough to begin the attack at once. The results, however, did not fulfill Calhoun's optimistic expectations, the whole campaign being a sorry tale of mismanagement, disloyalty and defeat. Half-trained armies led by the incapable Generals Hull, Dearborn, Van Rensselaer and Smith, crossed the border. The British General Brock and other able officers with small but efficient troops promptly put an end to the invasion and began a counter-attack. In August Fort Dearborn was abandoned: the Indians, furious because the Americans had destroyed all the guns and alcohol before their retreat, attacked and tomahawked the whole force.

This fiasco was soon, however, to be sweetened by a great ocean victory, won by "a bunch of pine boards under a bit of striped bunting," as the *Constitution* was contemptuously described by the British, the bravery of whose commander, the thirty-eight-year-old hero of the Tripoli War, Captain Isaac Hull, did much to appease the popular indignation against his cowardly and inefficient uncle.

Early in August the *Constitution* sailed from Boston with no orders other than to proceed to New York. After taking two prizes, on August 19 she encountered the British *Guerrière*, carrying forty-eight guns and carronades as against the *Constitution's* fifty-two, on a line between Cape Cod and Cape Race, and gave chase. The British ship threw a lighter broadside, but seeing no escape she indicated her readiness for a square fight, yard-arm to yard-arm, set her sails, and drew alongside. . .

Away on the distant shore a budding young poet, Henry W. Longfellow, listened to and recorded the thunder of the classic battle of the times. As the fire grew heavier, the

Guerrière's mizzen was shot away: the *Constitution*, keeping up a constant fire with guns double-shotted with grape and round-shot, was attempting to pass ahead to get a position across the bows of the enemy to rake, when her cabin caught fire. With the vessels alongside, each made an attempt to board the other; men sprang to the taffrail only to be mowed down by the deadly close-fire of musketry. Filling her sails, the *Constitution* shot ahead and her crew set about extinguishing the cabin fire and making repairs. In a few minutes she was ready to wear around for a position to rake the enemy, but the *Guerrière's* foremast had fallen, carrying the mainmast with it, and she lay a complete wreck on the water with three score and ten of her crew killed and wounded. The ensign was hoisted to the stump of her mizzen and hauled down in token of surrender. The battle had lasted just half an hour. At daylight the prisoners were transferred to the *Constitution*, the prize-crew recalled, and the wreck set afire.

Within six months of the declaration of war the American Navy had won six victories in six encounters at sea.

Observed the London *Independent Whig:* "Accustomed as we have hitherto been to a long and uninterrupted tide of success upon the watery element, and claiming an absolute and exclusive sovereignty over the ocean, to be defeated there where we securely rested our proudest hopes and wishes might reasonably be expected to check our insolence and mortify our pride. If . . . it would have the effect of inducing us to abate somewhat our unwarranted pretensions and listen to terms of moderation and forbearance, our regret would be sensibly diminished. . . But the mischief will not confine itself here: the charm of the invincibility of the British Navy being destroyed, the terror that has long preceded our flag and commanded the abject homage of surrounding nations will henceforward be dissipated, and every maritime power with whom we may be involved in war will fight with redoubled zeal, ardently and anxiously hoping to lower our ascendancy and establish the freedom of the seas."

Everywhere in America the news of the victory of "Old Ironsides"—as the *Constitution* was affectionately called—was hailed with outbursts of joy and pride. In New York and Philadelphia Captain Hull and his crew made a triumphant progress under flag-decked arches, and were entertained at magnificent banquets. Congress voted the crew fifty thousand dollars, and to the commander a gold medal, while swords and gold snuff-boxes poured in to him from all sections. (At the same time British Admiralty court-martialled the *Guerrière's* commander, Captain Dacre, for abandoning his ship.)

Admiral Warren was at Bermuda preparing to issue his paper-blockade of the Atlantic Coast and Mississippi River, and to plunder and burn the coast towns, particularly in the South (New England was to be spared). The Creeks were rising in the far South, and the British were strengthening their fortifications at Pensacola, Florida—Spanish territory. But a sigh of relief arose when it became known that the popular British-hating Major-General of the Tennessee Militia, the forty-six-year-old Andrew Jackson, was to command operations against the latter menace. It was talked about that the British were beginning to take the war in desperate earnest: internal conditions in England were none too good, as evidenced by the Ludite riots the year before; for the unrestricted use of machinery, resulting in supply outstripping demand, was depriving workers of employment and breeding discontent—a conjecture that appeared to be a certainty when eighteen workers were hanged at York under the new Draconian laws, for destroying machinery. The British Empire, said the wise ones, was on the verge of dissipation.

III

CALHOUN was present on the opening day of the second session of the Twelfth Congress which met on November 2. He immediately surrendered first place on the committee on

foreign relations in favor of Smilie of Pennsylvania, lest South Carolina be said to have too many important posts; but the latter insisted on an election and Calhoun was unanimously chosen. The most important issue of the session was the question of the Non-Importation Act which, in effect prior to the declaration of war, made shipments from England subject to forfeiture. Many American merchants abroad had erroneously assumed that with the repeal of the British orders-in-council the Non-Importation Act would be repealed, and they had accordingly loaded their ships with the accumulated proceeds of exports and sailed for home. Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin was in favour of demanding at least some share of the profits for the federal Government—a sum which, amounting to some twenty million dollars, was sorely needed by the almost bankrupt Government. It was probably Calhoun's efforts, ably supported by Cheves, which prevented this heavy loss to the shipping interests; and after much discussion a bill was passed directing the remission of the fines in all cases free from any fraud or effort at imposition. On March 4 Congress adjourned.

With the beginning of the year (1813) the war had flared into a fierceness that was to burn unabated until its close. The threatened blockade of the Southern coast finally resolved itself into sporadic attacks by pillaging parties landed in the Delaware and Chesapeake Bays. Georgetown and Frederickstown in Maryland were ravaged; then the British, chaffing under a defeat at Norfolk, proceeded to destroy Hampton, Virginia. Houses, even the furniture, were burned; slaves were stolen and shipped to the West Indies; women and children, seeing no escape from a ruthless foe, threw themselves into the sea.

When the Thirteenth Congress assembled by Act on May 24, Calhoun was again seated by election. A new district, made up of Edgefield and Abbeville, gave South Carolina a ninth member; and William Butler, who had formerly repre-

sented the district, withdrew in Calhoun's favour, remarking, "You can meet Randolph in debate; I cannot."

The War Hawks were noticeably less exuberant than during the preceding Congress. Then, with the excitement and hope incident to the declaration of war, enthusiasm had lightened the burden of their responsibility; now they were sobered by the realization that capacity and power must keep pace with responsibility. Moreover, the disasters of the first year of war had justified to some extent its opponents who referred to American efforts in the field as "two drivelling campaigns," and encouraged them to become more open in their attacks.

Among the opponents of the war was Daniel Webster who was just beginning his long and brilliant career in the federal service as a member of the House from New Hampshire. After presentation to the President, Webster wrote sneeringly: "I do not like his looks any more than his administration. I think I can clearly see in his features *Embargo*, *Non-Intercourse*, *War*. I hear that the taxes are going badly. Who cares? Poor Madison! We in New England are no patriots. We shall do what is required – no more."

Webster at once got busy to hamper the administration. On June 10 he introduced resolutions calling upon the Executive for information as to when, by whom, and in what manner, intelligence of the repeal of the Berlin and Milan decrees had first been communicated to the Government. His idea was, of course, to show that the administration had either been deceived by the French ministry, or that at the time war was declared the administration was already in possession of and had suppressed the repealing decree. Thus the United States would have been discredited in the war and forced to sue for an ignominious peace.

Calhoun, objecting primarily to the prying form in which Webster's resolutions were cast, undertook the defence of the administration. Then, after a few days, he suddenly dropped the matter, and voted affirmatively with his colleagues in

favour of the resolutions. The reason was, of course, obvious: Madison had made it plain he had nothing to fear from the inquiry, and rather welcomed it as giving him an opportunity to vindicate his position – an opportunity Secretary of State Monroe was quick to seize. Thus Webster unknowingly rendered the administration a service, but he interpreted it in another light. "We had a warm time of it for four days," he observed, "and then the other side declined further discussion."

It was during this session that the Massachusetts Remonstrance against the war was presented by Pickering. This paper, speaking of "the powers reserved to the State Sovereignties," maintained that "the States as well as the individuals composing them are parties of the *national compact*," and sought covertly to defend impressment by the British under the doctrine of national allegiance which was "too well founded, has been too long established, and is too consonant with the permanent interest, the peace and independence of all nations, to be disturbed for the purpose of substituting in its place certain visionary notions to which the French Revolution gave birth, and which though long exploded there seem still to have an unhappy influence in our country." Calhoun at once expressed his disapproval of the doctrine, and asserted that he would certainly "never countenance what might be considered a declaration of war by one State against another."

As a matter of fact, he was often now called upon to answer jibes at the administration's "subservience" to France – the favourite of the opposition next to the charge of waging a war of conquest against Canada – which he did mainly by ridicule, since to disprove it would have called for the proof of a negative. He was perfectly aware of the duplicity of the French Emperor and his agents, and of the fact that they might even lie on occasions – a realistic view that the anti-French but sentimental Webster had certainly not taken when he risked the success of his attack on the administration upon an offhand statement of the French Secretary – but at least

what the French did was for their country and there was a particular philosophy to justify the means to such an end, whereas what the Federalists were doing was against their country. "I hope that the doctrine you express is confined to yourself and has not many advocates even in your own party," he told the vitriolic Grosvenor of New York on one occasion in the House; and that was meant for Webster too. But his contempt was not meant to include the New England people who, he was convinced, were loyal in the body; and later when resolutions were offered to the end that the treasonable "blue lights" signalling with the enemy be investigated, he remarked that it was too petty to consider and moved that the resolutions be tabled.

But the opponents of the war were far from silenced, and took every occasion to attack the justice and policy of the war, expatiating upon its utter hopelessness, and in every way making it seem that they took a keen delight in their country's critical position. Nor did the adherents of the war neglect the opportunity to defend their war policy (in brilliant oratory ofttimes meant indirectly for their constituencies), and Calhoun had his share in the saturnalia of debate. In regard to the attack on Canada, he insisted that that was a necessity to keep the enemy's forces out of American territory. The true criterion was the motive and cause which led to the attack. "We must use the means most likely to force the enemy to respect our rights, and the war in Canada is the very best security for our own territory by forcing the enemy to concentrate his whole force there for its defence. The enemy presses us both on the seaboard and on our interior frontier. On the seaboard our war must be strictly defensive, on the Canada frontier wholly offensive. This was plainly our course, for if we have a sufficient army in that quarter, the enemy must call off all his force from our seaboard or at once lose his colonies." Fifty thousand men at least ought to be available to send against them. "I had hoped," he concluded, "that the miserably stale and absurd objections against

offensive operations in Canada had ceased till I heard yesterday the member from New Hampshire (Webster)."

And again, on the occasion when the opposition was trying to defeat the Loan Bill, a measure so vital to our welfare if not our independent existence, he touched on impressment and the claim of the opposition that the British merely took some of our men by mistake: "The British themselves admit there were sixteen hundred Americans on board their ships at the outbreak of war. . . The duty which the country owes to the impressed sailors originates in a single fact, that they are unjustly deprived by a foreign nation of their liberty. The principle on which they are deprived of their liberty, or the manner, constitutes no part of it. . . It is our duty, most sacredly our duty, to protect the life and liberty of our citizens against foreign oppression. Instead of doing our duty we have for many years quietly beheld them forced into hateful foreign service."

And finally, in answer to the contention that after recent events in Europe our efforts were useless, he admitted that "the enemy's power is great and his fortune at the flood. . . But such prosperity is the most fickle of human conditions. From the flood the tide dates its ebb. . . He can now no more claim to be struggling for existence. We cannot renounce our right to the ocean which Providence has spread before our doors, nor will we ever hold that which is the immediate gift of heaven under the license of any nation. We have already had success worthy of our cause. The future is audibly pronounced by the splendid victories over the *Guerrière*, *Java* and *Macedonian*. We, and all nations, are in them taught a lesson never to be forgot. Opinion is power. The charm of British naval invincibility is broken."

But events were now beginning to speak for themselves. Perry's green-timber navy won such a victory on Lake Erie as enabled America to regain control of the original territory under the Quaker General Jacob Brown and his two brigadiers, Winfield Scott and Ripley. MacDonough triumphed

over Provost, giving control of Lake Champlain to the Americans. The privateer blockade in the Irish Sea was striking deeply the "pocket-book of Great Britain," costing the latter twenty-five hundred vessels, seriously handicapping her commerce, and in the end making it difficult to insure British ships for even ten per cent. for a mere run across the Channel. One despatch boat was taken in the Straits of Dover, an enterprising merchantman was captured even after it had abandoned its convoy when within sight of the British coast, another at the very mouth of the Thames, and other prizes in crossing – all but two of which were eventually recaptured, but which nevertheless served to purchase a new respect in England for the American marine.

Captain David Porter, commanding the *Essex*, an 860-ton sloop carrying thirty-two guns, had sailed southward with his motto-flag *Free Trade and Sailors' Rights* and the original intention of attacking British resources by cruising against their whalers in the Pacific. After two successful encounters with the British *Alert* and the packet-ship *Necton* he had doubled the Cape of Good Hope in the winter storms and put into Valparaiso for refitting. In the fall he put into the Marquesas Islands of which he took possession in the name of the United States and renamed them Madison Islands. The beautiful harbour of Nukahiva he called Massachusetts Bay, and the small village consisting of half a dozen houses and a rope walk he christened Madisonville. The Happahs and Taeehs immediately made treaties with him; but the Typees, the most civilized of the tribes, with whom the others were at war, refused to treat with the invader, so Porter decided to make his allies' issue his own.

The annihilation of the Typees was merely a day's frolic for the Americans. The Typees fought bravely and heroically with their slings and stones, beating their drums and singing weird hymns to their gods for rain that would render the foreigners' bouhies, or fire-weapons, useless. Were they not wiser and more peaceful than their savage enemies? And

when forced to fight in self-defence were they not braver and more compassionate? Then surely the gods, who wished to destroy not men but wrong, could be appeased to destroy those novel fire-weapons against which courage and bravery were ineffectual! . . . By nightfall their peaceful and happy valley was a scene of desolation and horror and smoking ruins, the houses, war-canoes, even the plants and gods, all destroyed, its inhabitants completely at the mercy of inferior tribes. The Typees had been happy: now they had a history.

"They were the victims of a mistaken pride and courage," wrote Captain Porter sadly. There was, however, no hypocrisy in the utterance: David Porter never had the least doubt that God was on his side. He believed intensely in freedom, and expressed himself as vigorously against chattel slavery in the South as against foreign despotism, particularly British tyranny (having been twice impressed by the British when in the West Indian service); but opinionatedness, when supported by seriousness and courage, is a high attribute of a great military leader such as this thirty-four-year-old Bostonian had already proved himself to be at Santa Domingo and in the Tripoli War.

But though Nemesis is lame and tardy she is of colossal stature, and her strong arm was already unsheathing her sword – the *Phoebe* and the *Cherub*. These British frigates, under the command of Captain James Hillyer, a former close friend of Porter, had blockaded the *Essex* and her consort in the Valparaiso Harbour for several weeks. Both sides made a carnival of the situation, flying ensigns, jacks, motto and code-flags from every mast. *God and Country – British Sailors' Best Rights – Traitors Offend Both!* fluttered from the *Phoebe*'s mizzen; to which the Americans responded with the slogan, *God, Our Country and Liberty – Tyrants Offend Them!* There was much bantering between the sailors in songs and letters, and sometimes they fought when ashore; but the Americans were unsuspecting, particularly as Porter

had called away his boarders when the British ships had once fouled, on Hillyer's informing him categorically that he had no intention of attacking in a neutral port.

In March the Americans attempted to put to sea under pursuit, but in a severe squall the main topmast was carried away, and tacking about they re-entered the harbour and anchored within pistol-shot of the shore. Immediately the English took a position under their stern and opened fire. On the *Essex* the slaughter was terrific, and the Chilean Government refusing to intervene, Porter surrendered his sinking ship and was taken aboard the *Phoebe* where he was subsequently paroled with the other survivors and sent back to New York. With him was his twelve-year-old adopted son, Midshipman David Farragut of Tennessee, clutching a pet pig which he had saved from the slaughter. . .

About the same time the guns were booming at Valparaiso the Allied armies of Europe, with the Emperor of Russia and the King of Prussia at their head, were entering Paris. Encamped in the parks and gardens, the troops were welcomed with wild delight. "Long live the Bourbons! Long live Emperor Alexander! Down with the Tyrant (Napoleon)!" cried the fickle populace, treading underfoot the broken statues of their former idol whose armies had suffered such crushing defeats at Leipsic and in Spain.

Napoleon, in retirement at Fontainebleau, was deposed by the French Senate. The Allies refused to treat with him as a reigning sovereign, and on April 5, 1814, he signed an abdication and took a touching farewell of his Old Guard. "Dear eagle," he cried, kissing the emblem of France on their standard, "may this last embrace thrill forever in the hearts of all my faithful soldiers!" He departed at once for Elba, a little island on the coast of Italy. The French soldiers handed about violets, the badge of the Bonapartes, whispering, "He will return in the spring!"

Louis XVIII, a brother of the murdered Louis XVI, was

called to the throne; but as he rode in his carriage to Nôtre Dame the people looked coldly upon the stout, elderly, unwarlike figure and punned on his name: Louis *des Huitres.* Peace was made with all foreign countries, all the old boundaries restored, and the allied armies left France. Talleyrand journeyed to Vienna to represent France at the congress which Metternich had called to settle the affairs of Europe. France was now exactly where she was before the Revolution.

In America the ladies of fashion displayed their sentiments in a practical way, the Royalists wearing white pompons in their bonnets and eighteen tucks in their skirts, the Imperialists wearing bunches of violets. . .

Meantime, America was not faring very well in the war. The act of a private soldier had resulted in the burning of Newark and of the Assembly House in Canada, but the British had severely avenged it by the destruction of Youngstown, Tuscarora, Manchester (Niagara Falls), and Black Rock, in which many inhabitants were killed. All the territory America had gained on the northern frontier, except Michigan, was now lost: the settlers along the whole length of the Niagara who survived were shivering beside the smouldering embers of their homes.

Attacks on the Atlantic Coast continued. Several towns in Maryland and Virginia were burned. In August the British entered Washington, now a straggling town of eight thousand. President Madison, who was at dinner, fled before the attack; but Dolly paused to pack some of her more cherished possessions. The capitol building, of which only the wings had been built, was first destroyed. Admiral Cockburn led his men into the hall of the House of Representatives, and leaping into the speaker's chair, demanded jocosely: "Shall this harbour of Yankee democracy be burned? All for it will say *aye!*" The President's house and all the rest of the town except the patent-office, one hotel, and the jail, were destroyed. "The Cossacks spared Paris but we spared

not the Capital of America," observed a London newspaper. Fort Warburton was demolished, Alexandria was spared on condition of turning over all naval and ordnance stores, and on September 6 the British fleet sailed away.

Henry Clay and Jonathan Russell were at Gottenburg where they had joined John Quincy Adams, Albert Gallatin, and James Bayard to negotiate peace – a time carefully chosen by the British when the Americans would be more pliable because of the summer campaigns and the fact that Napoleon's defeat was permitting England to throw all her resources, directed by the veteran Wellington himself, who had been relieved in Spain after the defeat of the Imperial forces, against America. "The ill-organized association (America) is on the eve of dissolution," exulted the London *Times*, "and the world is speedily to be delivered of the mischievous example of the existence of a government founded on democratic rebellion." And once again this official organ of the Saviour of the World declared: "Next to the annihilation of the late military despotism in Europe, the subversion of that system of fraud and malignity which constitutes the whole policy of the Jeffersonian school is an event to be devoutly wished by every man in either hemisphere who has any regard for rational liberty or the honourable intercourse of nations. It is an event to which we should have bent, and yet must bend, all our energies. The American government must be displaced or it will sooner or later plant its poisoned dagger in the heart of the parent-State."

This was in the fall of 1814 – before even the *Times* had grasped the significance of the new resistance of Jacob Brown and Winfield Scott at Lundy's Lane and Fort Erie, and of MacDonough's victory at Lake Champlain and Provost's retreat to Canada which gave control of that water to America and put an end to any hope of the British for an accession of territory. "The flag," wrote Francis S. Key on the back of an old letter as he anxiously watched (from the British fleet

where he had been sent under a flag of truce and held prisoner) the bombardment of Fort McHenry at Baltimore, "is still there!" . . .

BUT the end of the war was now nearer than most people hoped, reaching its *dénouement* in the Ghent Peace (fittingly enough in keeping with the whole perverse affair) before its climax in the brilliant victory of General Andrew Jackson at New Orleans.

At the time Francis S. Key was unknowingly composing the National Anthem at Baltimore, General Jackson with five thousand raw troops from Tennessee was rapidly progressing through Alabama and Georgia making short shift of hostile Creeks who, according to report, were carrying British fire-arms, leading to the natural supposition that they were being incited by British agents across the Florida border. Florida was Spanish territory, but Jackson felt justified in garrisoning Fort Barrancas guarding the Pensacola harbour until such time as its neutrality could be maintained. Before his arrival, however, the British blew up the fort and sailed away. The Americans then hurried to Mobile where the British after a futile attempt to take Fort Bowyer had lost their flagship *Hermes* and sailed away to concentrate all their forces against New Orleans. Jackson immediately gave the order to march to the latter city.

All the Indian villages en route were ruthlessly destroyed and the inhabitants exterminated whether or not they sued for peace. Most of them consisted merely of scaffolds for drying meat and rude "wampons" before which the fires were still burning. Even the holy cities, without paths and reached only by trails known to the Indians, in which white men had never before set foot (unless to serve as a victim for the sacrificial rites held by the prophets in the little square where stakes stood always ready with wood piled about them), were sought out and razed. The tombs of the chiefs – built in the ground so substantially with timber and clay that no rain or

air could enter, in which the dead were reverently laid upon their blankets, their heads towards the sunrise, their rifles by their side, a tin pan and a spoon on their breasts – were violated for the ear-rings, brooches and other trifles of jewelry to be found there. "While we fight the savage who makes war only because he delights in blood and who gets his booty when he has scalped his victims, we are through him contending against an enemy of a more inveterate character and deeper design," declared General Jackson.

The troops found New Orleans, a city of twenty thousand, in a state of great excitement, without forts or defences, and indeed without any plan of control or protection. Jackson immediately took charge. This tall, vigorous, blue-eyed and thin-jawed activist and pragmatist had his stubborn mind set upon a single track – to crush the overwhelming odds of the hated British and to cover himself with glory. He had the militia called out, summoned Coffee and his two thousand men from Mobile, appealed to the free Negroes for help, released all convicts and drafted them in service, and even sent for the pirate Jean Lafitte of Barataria Bay (who had first revealed to the Louisiana Governor the enemy's plans and how they had offered him a captaincy and a free pardon for his gang with free land-grants in the event of success, for which the Governor had retaliated by breaking up Lafitte's establishment, capturing his nine vessels, and imprisoning his men). Martial law was proclaimed, the city fortified, and a hundred and fifty thousand bales of cotton moved to a strategic position for breastworks. Then General Jackson dined with the Livingstons on Chartres Street, and marked time while awaiting the expected levies of troops from Kentucky and Tennessee . . . and the arrival of the British.

It was a motley, ill-assorted, unequipped and under-armed army that awaited the coming of Wellington's veterans. A few disgruntled farmer lads, under the impression that they could do as they chose in a democratic army, attempted to depart from the scene, whereupon Jackson promptly had

them all shot. Not for fear, however, was the bulk of the army loyal: every soldier realized that only a miracle of leadership could secure their safety by victory. With Jackson was a twenty-year-old Virginian named Sam Houston, of Scotch-Indian blood, without much education save in woodlore – he was the adopted son of an Indian chief with whom he had spent his boyhood – whose bravery and efficiency at the Battle of Horseshoe Bend had attracted Jackson's attention and brought him promotion to sergeant. Another companion was the twenty-seven-year-old North Carolinian, David Crockett, whose parents had moved to Tennessee in his boyhood to start a tavern. Generous, brave and good-natured, a farmer by necessity and a hunter by preference, Scout Crockett was a fury when there was fighting to be done, but when there was not he loved indolence and telling funny stories which he did in a language all his own – spelling being to him "contrary to nature" and grammar "nothing at all."

Admiral Cochran, who had sailed from Jamaica on November 24, was drawing closer to New Orleans to establish his English Army Investment with the fifteen-million-dollar spoils in sugar and cotton which, so he thought, was easily within grasp. With the fleet were a score of merchant ships, a full assortment of civic officers to administer the new province, and even an official printer with his press. Wellington had first been thought of as Duke-regnant; but ultimately his brother-in-law, Sir Edward Pakenham, was chosen.

On December 11 twenty-four hundred British troops entered Lake Borgne and three days later captured the American gunboats and landed on the banks of the Mississippi nine miles below the city. Major Gabriel Villère's plantation near Bayou Bienvenue was occupied and the owner held prisoner, but he escaped and hid in a cypress tree in the swamp with his dog (which he later had to strangle with his own hands when it began to whine) and brought the news to Jackson. Major Villère spoke only French: de la Croix interpreted.

"By the Eternal!" swore Jackson, "they shall not sleep on our soil! Gentlemen, the British are below. We must fight them tonight." To an aide: "Tell General Carroll to move at the head of the Bayou Bienvenue and stop the enemy! General Claiborne, take post with the State militia out on the Gentilly Road and repel any attack there! My compliments to Major Pauche, and request him to hurry his command to the City!"

Three hours later the General was sitting on his horse outside the Fort St. Charles gate reviewing his troops: Beal's Rifles, sixty picked professional men and citizens, some of whom still wore their ruffled shirts; handsome Coffee and his Rifles of Tennessee; the half-breed Pierre Jugeat with his Choctaw Scouts; Hind's Mississippi Dragoons, and last of all Major d'Aquin leading his coloured battalion. In all, less than four thousand raw recruits against nearly four times as many efficient British troops.

From the beginning poor judgment and misfortune dogged the British efforts. Their badly constructed canals caved in; their too few boats were badly handled; their fascines and ladders, made of sheaves of sugar-cane, were ineffective or tardily brought. A rain and a frost added to their plight. Admiral Cochran, furious at the delay in taking the city, taunted the British Army with a threat to send two hundred of his Bully Boys to do the fighting and let the soldiers carry their luggage. The army girded itself for a supreme effort.

Deserters had informed the British that the Americans' weakest point was the extreme left, and this (now strengthened, however, with the newly arrived Tennessee and Kentucky Rifles) was attacked in column by three hundred troops under Gibbs with the Irish regulars preceding and bearing fascines and ladders; while a thousand Egyptians, preceded by a West Indian black regiment, attacked the right; and midway a hundred Highlanders under Keane stood ready to support either column.

As they advanced, the British columns were mown down. Many of the Americans had no weapons but long-bladed knives and tomahawks, but in the fog and smoke they wielded these with deadly precision. The Irish and Negro regiments fled in confusion. Gibbs and Keane were seriously wounded. Pakenham was killed, his last words being the wish that he might "live till tomorrow to hang Mullins" who had failed him with the fascines. It was January 8. The battle had begun Christmas Eve.

There was a day's armistice to care for the wounded and bury the dead. Pakenham was buried under a pecan tree, but later his remains were preserved in rum and sent to England. The British fleet sailed away. General Jackson was crowned with a laurel wreath at the Place d'Armes in New Orleans, after which he rode under a great triumphal arch to the old Cathedral where a solemn *Te Deum* was sung.

The Battle of New Orleans was the one glorious land victory of the war, though a useless one, the war having already ended on Christmas Eve by the Treaty of Ghent. Its importance in political history was, however, inestimable: the victory had made Andrew Jackson a hero, and a hero in the American tradition was a likely candidate for the Presidency. In far-off Washington, Calhoun was unknowingly rejoicing in what was destined to be the most telling blow to his cherished ambition; but so merciful is the veil that covers the face of futurity that no prescience of adversity marred his immediate joy in Jackson's great victory.

IV

THE news of the Ghent Peace became officially and generally known in Washington on February 14, 1815. A wave of national feeling swept over the entire country, already thrilling to the news of Jackson's great triumph that had caused Henry Clay, in far-off Paris, to exclaim: "Now I can go to England without mortification!" Though there had been

many disasters, the triumphs were such as to inspire a young nation with audacity to throw down the gauntlet to the giant power of Europe. The administration suddenly leapt into great favour.

"I feel pleasure and pride in being able to say that I am of a party which drew the sword on the question, and succeeded in the contest; for, to all political purposes, we have achieved a complete success," declared Calhoun. The war had left a deep impression on him, and he recognized it as a potent factor in ending sectional minorities and welding the States into one Union. Later he said, "Much anxiety has recently been evinced to be independent of English broadcloths and muslins. I hope it indicates the approach of a period when we shall also throw off the thraldom of thought."

The War of 1812 was, to him, both necessary and gallant — a pathetic gallantry that rebuked the deprecations of the Tories and Federalists who were even then in Washington demanding a division of taxes following the precepts laid down at the Hartford Convention when they had advanced the principle (in terms they had themselves so bitterly denounced in the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions at the time of the Alien and Sedition Acts) that the States must be the judges and execute their own decisions when the federal Government exceeded its powers, there being no common umpire. For, declared Webster, "it is the solemn duty of the State governments to protect their own authority over the militia, and to interpose between their citizens and arbitrary power. These are among the objects for which the State governments exist, and their highest obligations bind them to the preservation of their own rights and liberties." When news arrived of Jackson's victory, the Federalists hurried home to the jeers of the Democratic press. But they must have known they would not be permanently discredited, for the spirit of "federalism" or acquisitive pragmatism is easily invoked on occasions when men tire of disinterested idealism. . .

THE peace celebration had interrupted the chief discussion that occupied the last war sessions of Congress, that centring around the struggle to establish a national bank. President Madison, an ex-Federalist, had always favoured a stronger central Government and a national bank; and the period of hostilities gave colour, as well as cause, for resort to such a national institution. A year before, Lefferts of New York had presented a petition for the bank, and upon Calhoun's motion it was printed and referred (the latter against Calhoun's wishes) to the committee on ways and means of which the chairman was Jefferson's son-in-law, John W. Eppes, an uncompromising opponent of the bank, who promptly reported adversely upon the ground of unconstitutionality. Calhoun met the difficulty by suggesting that the bank be established in the District of Columbia; and though a bill to this effect was reported, it was made quite clear that such an institution could not furnish a national uniform currency, and, since the power to establish branches was refused, the whole matter was allowed to drift.

In the meantime the condition of the finances had grown steadily worse. Paper money depreciated rapidly, and at varying rates in different parts of the country, and soon specie payments were stopped south of New England. Hanson of Maryland told the House that not only had government bills been dishonoured, and the interest of the public debt remained unpaid, but so completely empty was the Treasury and so destitute its credit that funds could not be obtained to defray the current ordinary expenses of the different departments. The Department of State was unable even to pay its stationary bills, the Paymaster was unable to meet demands for paltry sums of less than thirty dollars, and the War Department had had several acceptances which had been protested by the public notary. The state of affairs was, obviously, close to chaos.

Secretary of the Treasury Gallatin being absent in Europe and his return not expected, Madison fixed upon Alexander

James Dallas, a Philadelphia lawyer, a native of Jamaica and a man of "tropical excitability" (according to Ingersoll), as Gallatin's successor. At first Dallas's appointment was opposed by Pennsylvania politicians; but even politics was forced to bow to such grave necessity, so that in the end Senator Leacock of that State notified the President's secretary, "Tell Doctor Madison that we are now willing to submit to his Philadelphia lawyer. The public patient is very sick, and we must swallow anything the doctor prescribes, however nauseous the bollus." The appointment of Dallas, as everyone knew, meant a national bank. Speaker Cheves had cleverly set the stage by reappointing Eppes as chairman of the ways-and-means committee but reconstituting the body so that Eppes was the only anti-bank member. Now Eppes proposed further issues of Treasury notes and some increases in taxation, but Dallas replied promptly and strongly in favour of a national bank. The House passed a resolution favouring such an institution with branches, and a bank bill was accordingly reported embodying the main features of Dallas's plan.

When Calhoun arrived in Washington the bank question was well under way in the committee. Immediately he called on Dallas and promised to give the project his consideration. At the time he had given little reflection to the subject of banking (so he wrote) but being urged by his friends to take a prominent part in the issue he proceeded to examine the plan fully. He had not gone far before he was struck with its extraordinary character. "I saw at once that the effect of the arrangement would be that the Government would borrow back its own credit and pay six per cent. for what they had already paid eight or nine. *It was impossible for me to give it my support under any pressure, however great.* I felt the difficulty of my situation not only in opposing the leading measure of the administration at such a crisis, but, what was far more responsible, to suggest one of my own that would afford relief to the embarrassed Treasury. I cast

my eyes around and soon saw that the Government could use its own credit directly, without the intervention of a bank; which I proposed to do in the form of Treasury notes, to be issued in the operations of the Government. . ."

Calhoun's speeches against the bank were not preserved, it being his custom never to publish utterances opposing his friends. He bore in patience the denunciations levelled against him, his enemies making much of his predilection for Treasury notes as "an apostle of that frequently recurring creed of the uselessness of bullion and the essential superiority of the promise-to-pay." "While the bank was undergoing its many trials in Congress," stated Ingersoll, "even Mr. Calhoun was pleased with that novelty. The *National Intelligencer* was filled with its metaphysics."

If Calhoun did not clearly state his two main objections to Dallas's plan it was because he sought to maintain his standing with his party despite his opposition upon a specific point, and so confined himself merely to defeating the bill and not distracting the party or injuring the administration. But his objections were valid in that they were idealistic and patriotic: the one being that he thought the administration's bill had been drawn entirely in the interests of the financial classes, resulting in giving to those from whom the Government had already borrowed on very disadvantageous terms the additional premium of the bank dividend (Calhoun's proposal was designed to protect the interests of the people); and the other being his fears that grave results might flow from the varying degrees of depreciation in different portions of the country (for the import trade would inevitably gravitate towards that part where the depreciation was at its worst) and cause each section to vie with the other to attain such evil pre-eminence, thus producing collusions extremely *dangerous to the Union.*

The debate on Calhoun's proposal was warm, and even Dallas admitted that his views were exhibited in a clear, connected, and well-digested discourse on this complicated sub-

ject in which he showed careful preparation and a capacity for explaining and supporting any project; "but I declare my unequivocal opinion that his appears to me to be the most fantastic, impracticable, and, I will add, pernicious of all the plans we could adopt, calculated inevitably to destroy the public credit of this Government – to damn it to all eternity." Notwithstanding this opinion, which probably reflected the views of the administration, Calhoun's substitute was passed; and though his triumph was short and Dallas ultimately had his way, a young man who could so quickly overthrow the plans of a popular administration was surely one to be reckoned with. Moreover, it revealed that if he did favour a national bank, the institution he wanted was farther from the Monster of Chestnut Street than this plan had been from Madison's. . .

In March the third session of the Thirteenth Congress adjourned *sine die*, and Calhoun returned to South Carolina.

The same month Napoleon escaped from Elba and returned to France, thus initiating the "Hundred Days" that ended at Waterloo and carried him into permanent exile at St. Helena. In the coach in which the Little Corsican was travelling when taken prisoner was a carefully annotated copy of Machiavelli's *The Prince*. Louis XVIII cautiously returned to Paris (whence he had fled at Napoleon's approach) and proceeded to make it clear that with the backing of the conservative European powers he meant to restore the old prerogatives of royalty.

On the plain of Vertus, near Chalons in France, the pious and despotic, liberal and reactionary, Czar Alexander I of All the Russias, the grandson of the Great Catherine, chagrined at his forces' absence from Waterloo and anxious to display his prestige as the first Prince of Europe, paraded his hundred-and-sixty thousand tall Guards, grenadiers, artillery and Cossack-horse, after which at seven field-altars ranged about the plain, bearded prelates of the Orthodox

Church, splendid in cloth-of-gold and jewel-encrusted copes, sonorously intoned the Holy Eucharist, while Alexander and his two precious colleagues, Francis of Austria and Frederick-William III of Prussia, withdrew to a purple pavilion to affix their signatures to a "Holy Alliance of Justice, Christian Charity and Peace," which called upon the Saviour and the Scriptures for light and leading . . . and bound them to a score of tyranny, divine right and legitimacy in Europe as a counter-force to the French Revolution and to combat the spread of the dreaded revolutionary spirit. Lacking only England, Turkey, and the Papacy, the Holy Alliance was now the dominant force in the old country – restoring the unholy Ferdinand VII and the Inquisition to Spain, and another Bourbon prince to Italy, both of which countries were seething with the libertarian spirit; and menacing with its iron hand, two fingers of which were crossed in the form of a blessing, the new countries across the sea.

The next year would be election year in democratic America. James Monroe was by common consent accepted as the logical successor of James Madison, also continuing a dynasty, but of another sort – the Virginia Dynasty.

V

THE year 1816 was a momentous one in congressional history. The necessity of meeting general public and national exigencies brought a series of important legislation all of which was more or less dovetailed. The problem of national unity and military preparedness (in view of the menace of the Holy Alliance) brought up the question of the necessary revenue; the question of revenue involved the matter of the tariff; the matter of the tariff was related to the issue of the bank and the new territories; and so on contingently. The alliance of the South and West in supporting the war by furnishing most of the leaders and recruits, and more particularly the dynamics, led the country to look to the same

combination to solve the problems entailed by the war. Or, as Calhoun expressed it in opposing Nathaniel Macon's amendment to base the apportionment of the measure to draft eighty thousand militia on the military strength (that is, the free white population) since only the whites served in the South, instead of on the basis of federal representation: "Since the Southern States had a considerable agency in the declaration of war, I am willing, upon the ground of liberality and generosity, to take hold of the labouring oar."

The Capitol building, except for the outer walls, having been destroyed, the federal business was conducted in a nearby house. (Madison, like Jefferson, resisted all efforts to move the Capital from the "desecrated city" back to the "President's House" built by Hoban at Philadelphia.) The House convened on December 4, 1815, and Calhoun took his seat the same day. He was promptly made chairman of the specially created committee on uniform national currency by Speaker Clay; but, as it transpired, the office was a key-position in shaping all the related legislation of the session.

Thus we find him speaking early in January upon a bill to establish three additional military academies. The object of the bill, he said, was to "contribute to the national security by the diffusion of military knowledge," and the only question was as to the best mode to produce a national spirit. He hoped it would not be long before there would be a military academy in "every considerable State in the Union." He believed the bill, therefore, the most important one on the table "now that we see everywhere a nationality of feeling; sentiments in every part of the House in favour of Union against a sectional spirit." He was not optimistic about future wars with Great Britain (who, though not joining the Holy Alliance, had certainly not opposed its purpose): "I am sure that future wars with England are not only possible, but I will say more, that they are highly probable – nay, that they will certainly take place." The broad question before the House, he had already declared, was whether the Govern-

ment should act on an enlarged policy . . . or whether it would go on in the old imbecile mode contributing by our measures nothing to the honour, nothing to the reputation of the country. He wanted to put our strength into the Navy, but he would also arm the militia, extend their term of service, and in general increase their efficiency. He knew the danger of large standing armies, and looked upon the militia as the true force: "Your defence ought to depend on the land, on a regular draught from the body of the people."

This led to a kindred topic – the establishment of roads and opening of canals in various parts of the country. "Your population is largely dispersed. . . We ought to contribute as much as possible to the formation of good military roads, not only on the score of political economy, but to enable us in emergencies to collect the whole mass of our military means on the point menaced." Later, on the subject of national power, he demanded: "What can be more perfect than a perfect unity in every part, in feelings and sentiments? And what can be more powerful to produce it than overcoming the effects of distance?" The American people were second to none in muscular power, enterprising habits, and in gallant courage; but they were materially weak in occupying a surface prodigiously great in proportion to their numbers. "No country enjoying freedom ever occupied anything so great . . . but let it not be forgotten, let it forever be kept in mind, that our very vastness exposes us to the greatest of all calamities *next to the loss of our liberty*, and even to that in its consequence – disunion! . . . Little does he deserve to be entrusted with the liberties of this people who does not raise his mind to these truths. We are under the most imperious obligation to counteract every tendency to disunion. The strongest of all cements is undoubtedly the wisdom, justice, and above all, the moderation of this House. . . Let us, then, bind the Republic together with a perfect system of roads and canals. Let us conquer space!"

Such was the "broad nationalism" which Calhoun was later

accused of having abandoned for narrow *étatisme;* and yet at the time he had plainly put union as secondary to liberty, and warned Congress that the latter depended upon their moderation. When the test should come, which principle would he choose? There was never in his mind the least doubt about that. Moreover, his interest in internal improvements was not altogether divorced from sectionalism at the time: the levelling of the Alleghenies, making possible easy communication between Washington and Pittsburgh, Richmond and Cincinnati, and providing markets for Kentucky and the Northwest at Baltimore, Richmond and Charleston, would make the political union of the South and West all the stronger, thus rendering New England harmless and another Hartford Convention impossible. In this connection he was at one with Jefferson and Clay – the latter not yet having seen that the union of the North and West, based on industry, was the inevitable one.

John Randolph raised his squeaking voice in a cryptic warning. "If Congress can legislate on roads and canals, it can legislate on emancipation," he said. . .

BUT military academies and armies, roads and canals, required money, and the federal finances were already in a chaotic condition. Where would the needed revenues come from?

"It is the duty of this country, as a means of defence, to encourage the domestic industry, more especially that part of it which provides the necessary materials for clothing and defence (for the armies). I lay the claims of the manufacturers entirely out of view, but on general principles, without regard to their interest, a certain encouragement should be extended, at least to our woolen and cotton manufactures. . . This nation," Calhoun concluded, "is in a situation similar to that of Hercules in his youth, whom the ancient writer represents as retiring into the wilderness to deliberate on the course of life which he ought to pursue. Two goddesses approach him; one recommends a life of ease and pleasure,

the other a life of labour and virtue. The hero adopted the counsel of the latter, and his fame and glory are known to the world. May this nation, the youthful Hercules, possessing his form and muscles, be inspired with similar sentiments and follow his example."

This peroration on virtue and patriotism was not altogether sententious for there was a meaning hidden in it. Both New England and the West would profit directly by the tariff – the former in trade, the latter in internal improvements. The South, whose interests were predominantly agrarian (South Carolina had but one cotton mill), would profit materially not at all, but only in the good the measure effected for the common defence, what provided justice to the struggling manufacturers, and in a more stable Union of the nations. "Neither agriculture, manufactures, nor commerce, taken separately, is the cause of wealth; it flows from the three combined and cannot exist without each. . . When separated entirely and permanently they perish. . . When our manufactures are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon will be under the fostering care of the Government, we shall no longer experience these evils." Thus the tariff which Calhoun sponsored was limited, temporary, and had for its main object the raising of sorely needed revenues, such protection as it afforded being quite secondary; in contrast with the later tariff which had for its main object the protection of monopoly and the matter of revenue only incidental.

Randolph caustically denounced the measure as one to support a "mushroom interest," a "scheme of public robbery," the levying of "an immense tax on one portion of the country to put money into the pockets of another. . . Who will pay for it? The poor man and the slave-holder!"

Calhoun, looking ahead, thought the precedent was worth the price if it established the rights of Southern property; for with the rapid expansion of the country, great territories being opened and new States about to be admitted, it was clear that for the protection of slavery in the distant future

the South needed an open field for the increase of States with pro-slavery representation in Congress. "If gentlemen are of the opinion that our Navy ought not to be improved; that internal improvements should not be persecuted – if these are their sentiments, then they are right in desiring the abolishment of all taxes," he answered.

The general belief that Calhoun was the author of the first important tariff measure and that the South pushed it through was erroneous in both respects. Calhoun was not even on the committee that framed the bill – Lowndes reported it as chairman of the ways and means – and was merely called in at a critical juncture when the bill seemed lost to make what was perhaps the most influential speech for the measure; and when the tariff became a law in April it was by the combined votes of the Middle West and New England (though Webster, representing the dwindling shipping interests, opposed the bill). The South as a whole opposed the tariff, even South Carolina, despite the influence of Calhoun and Lowndes, giving less than half her votes for it. . .

Calhoun repeatedly denied that his support of the tariff was directly connected with his desire for a national bank. "In supporting the bank of 1816," he afterward stated, "I openly declared that as a question *de novo* I would be decidedly against the bank and would be the last to give it my support. I also stated that in supporting it then I yielded to the necessity of the case growing out of the existing and long-established connection between the Government and the banking system. I took the ground even at that early period that so long as the condition existed – so long as the Government received and paid away bank notes as money – they were bound to regulate their value, and had no alternative but the establishment of a national bank."

That is, the rate of discount varying materially in different parts of the country (being at its worst at Washington), the Government had been forced to collect its dues in this depreciated currency and soon fell to accepting the paper in

place of payment. Thus the Government was robbed of its income at the fountainhead; and a curious result, which further contributed to drying up the sources of revenue, was that the import trade of the country was turned into the waters of Chesapeake Bay where the depression was at its worst, so that the importer paid tariff charges there to the Government in the cheapest money and then shipped his goods to other sections where they brought a price in higher money.

In his opening message, therefore, Madison stated the imperative need of a uniform currency, stating that until the precious metals could again be introduced it devolved upon the wisdom of Congress to provide a substitute which should equally engage the confidence and accommodate the wants of the citizens throughout the Union. "If the operation of the State banks cannot produce this result, the probable operation of a national bank will merit consideration."

Thus Calhoun, as chairman of the currency committee, had thrust upon him an important role in the creation of the bank; and though the whole project was in strict discord with the inherited beliefs of his party, he frankly announced his independence to support it and made his reasons sufficiently clear.

Secretary of the Treasury Dallas's annual report had again recommended the bank, and after an exchange of views with him, Calhoun reported the bill. Many of the objections to the bank raised at the former session, especially that as to whether the institution should be founded on war-stock alone or on earlier issues as well, had been removed by peace; but the opposition, chiefly from the Federalist side centring around Webster (Randolph, genius that he was, opposed it independently for far-sighted reasons of his own), was so evenly balanced with the support that as late as March Calhoun declared he despaired of the bill being passed. However, it did; and its passage was undoubtedly due entirely to Calhoun's vigorous and untiring prosecution of the matter. The bank was to be at Philadelphia, was to have branches,

and the Government was to appoint five of the twenty-five directors. Its notes were to be received for all dues of the Government; it was to transfer money for the Government without charge, and it was to pay a bonus of a million and a half.

Speaking of its constitutionality, he pointed out that it was the state of our circulating medium which was opposed to the principles of the Constitution. The power was given to Congress by that instrument in express terms to regulate the currency of the United States. The only object the framers of the Constitution could have in view in giving to Congress the "power to coin money, regulate the value thereof and of foreign coin," must have been to give a steadiness and fixed value to the currency of the United States. He presumed one of the first rules of such a bank would be to take the notes of no bank which did not pay in gold or silver, which would produce a powerful effect all over the Union. . .

THE most important legislation of the Fourteenth Congress had been political and national in its purpose. Sectional economic antagonisms had not yet been raised to the point of political and constitutional expression, and most of the differences had been discussed from individual viewpoints of sectional interests rather than from mass-pressure.

Since the war popular democracy was growing more confident and resourceful, more impatient with the older conservatism. In December, when there was pending a proposal to amend the Constitution so as to "establish a uniformity of the mode of election (i.e., by districts) in all the States, or representatives to Congress and electors of President and Vice-President," Calhoun observed that the question was of great importance and he thought the proposed amendment "would remove some evils which experience has shown to exist, and which in future time, if uncorrected, may menace the existence of the Republic."

Jefferson came out of retirement at *Monticello* to attack the

county courts which in Virginia practically chose candidates for the Legislature, which in turn selected the Governor and judges of the higher courts, and created new districts and counties at will to continue their power. No doubt Jefferson still remembered how the Federalists, defeated in his Revolution of 1800 at the polls, had retreated into the Judiciary as a stronghold; and now he saw the same powers waxing strong on legal legerdemain as its adherents laid off their farmer's clothes and put on the smooth garb of corporation directors and financial magnates, and their clergy and votaries of the law, always at the bidding of society's strongest, took their places in the system. Like sermons, legal briefs were undergoing change: leading lawyers were ceasing to plead in petit courts to inferior magistrates, and had learned to devise forms of contracts, to lobby in legislatures, and even . . . to appear before the Supreme Court where a decision of Chief Justice Marshall was always to be found in support of the financial interests of the East at the expense of regional agrarianism.

Jefferson's letter precipitated a furious row; whereupon he again wrote Littleton W. Tazewell pleading that his first letter be suppressed. Jefferson was now seventy-three . . . and he wanted peace.

VI

In November following his inauguration Monroe offered Calhoun the war portfolio. Monroe had at first designed his cabinet in such a way as to have each of the great sections of the country represented, taking John Quincy Adams from the North for the State Department, William H. Crawford from the South for the Treasury, and from the West either Isaac Shelby or Henry Clay of Kentucky or Andrew Jackson of Tennessee for the War Office. Clay indignantly refused the post, having expected the Secretaryship of State so as to be in line for the succession to the Presidency; Shelby decided he was too old for it, and Jackson indicated he would decline the nomination.

Calhoun though the fourth selection was not the fourth choice, he having been in Monroe's mind all the time as the logical (if not the expedient) man for the War Office, both because of his deep interest in military affairs and because he had been very close to Monroe when the latter had acted as Secretary of War for some months after the fall of Washington in 1814. The President intimated, moreover, that he had sounded the Army's sentiment in the matter and found it deep in Calhoun's favour. But Crawford maintained it was his influence that had prompted the President to nominate Calhoun. Adams also approved of the choice, declaring: "Calhoun is a man of fair and candid mind, of honourable principle, of clear understanding, of cool self-possession, of enlarged philosophic views, and of ardent patriotism. He is above all sectional and factious prejudices more than any statesman of this Union that I have ever encountered."

Now that he had a post which would permit him more leisure, Calhoun brought his wife and two children to Washington; and after visiting two months at the Lowndes home, took a house on E Street North near the residence of his friend William Winston Seaton, one of the editors of the *National Intelligencer*. It was inevitable that their eminence, charm and hospitality would soon make the Calhouns leaders in the social life of the city. Calhoun at the time was only thirty-five, and already he was one of the leading men in Congress, a forceful speaker who disdained oratorical trimmings, and a political manager of no small talent, who might be destined for the highest political office in the Union; while at the same time his simplicity, perfect manners, and captivating conversation, had won him a wide circle of personal friends. His wife, ten years younger, of distinguished and wealthy lineage, was a beautiful and intelligent woman, in every way a graceful complement of her husband. Their dinners and balls were the most select at the Capital. Many saw in this elaborate entertainment a wise bid for support to further Calhoun's ambition; but as it transpired it was his

family's social prestige at Washington that precipitated one of the most crushing blows to his career. . .

CALHOUN took hold of his new duties with enthusiasm and intelligence. For nearly three years the department had had no head with a single eye to its business, and the condition of affairs would have discouraged a less patient man. Unsettled accounts amounting to forty-five million dollars stood in the accounts. There was no unity or management, and very little discipline. He had, by his own admission, paid little attention to strictly military matters, and had never read a treatise on the subject except a small volume on the staff. He resolved, therefore, to "do as little as possible for the time but listen and observe closely" until he could gain a knowledge of the actual state of the department and its needs.

The first thing to do was to create a board of officers to prepare regulations for field service. One of the greatest offenders in the matter of discipline was the popular General Andrew Jackson, who had gone so far as to issue instructions to his subordinates to ignore orders from the War Office (sent unethically over his head), and had personally written the President assuming all responsibility for the "proper disobedience" of his subordinates. Again, when it was necessary to call the irascible General to task for failure to carry out regulations, the Secretary made it clear that if they were not he would not hesitate to "resort to the proper means of enforcing them." At another time, when Jackson was engaged in putting down the treacherous Seminoles in southern Georgia, and had marched into the Spanish territory of Florida and summarily hanged two Englishmen who were inciting the Indians there to acts of violence in Georgia, Calhoun remarked at a Cabinet meeting that he thought the General should be court-martialled – not because he thought the Englishmen were undeservedly punished, but because Jackson had taken upon himself the discretion of the United States Government in dealing with a foreign power. (He also

suspected that the matter had had something to do with American land-speculation at St. Marks, one of the Florida towns occupied by Jackson.) Jackson was not court-martialled, however; but instead when Florida was purchased from Spain he was made Governor—an office he executed in his usual arbitrary way until he finally resigned ostensibly in disgust but really to get his hat ready for the presidential ring. Calhoun had voted unanimously with the Cabinet to drop the charges, and as a matter of fact he had only liking and admiration for the capable soldier who had inspired the former to exclaim when he heard that England meant to concentrate her forces under Wellington against America: "We have our Jackson to oppose their Wellington!" 41337

Calhoun's most notable accomplishment in the War Office was to work out, with the help of technical men around him, a system of centring the head of the Army as well as the heads of the various branches—the quartermaster, the commissary, and the surgeon-general—in Washington, "thus bringing the military administration of the Army, as well as its pecuniary, through the several subordinate branches, under the immediate inspection and control of the Government." It was his idea that every distinct branch of the staff should terminate in a chief to be stationed, at least in times of peace, near the seat of government and be made responsible for its condition. When the whole plan was in working order it should be submitted to Congress so that, as law, it might form the basis for the development of this branch of the military service in the distant future.

As Secretary of War he was also responsible for the expansive organization of the Army that was to come into universal use. His plan was to reduce the rank and file in peace times while the corps of officers was to be mainly preserved. The adjutant general's, quartermaster general's, and commissary's departments were to have permanent chiefs but the subordinate grades were to be filled by details from the line. "The great and leading objects of a military establishment in peace

ought to be to create and perpetuate military skill and experience, so that at all times the country may have a sufficient and efficient body of officers; and the organization ought to be such as to enable the Government at the commencement of hostilities to obtain a regular force prepared for actual service," he wrote. In the event of hostilities, there should be nothing to model or create; consequently, the only difference between the peace and war formation of the Army was a matter of magnitude, so that "the dangerous transition from peace to war may be made without confusion or disorder." West Point, formerly an academy exclusively for engineers, was reorganized and given a standing of its own.

Nor did he overlook the needs of the West. Several military expeditions were sent out to explore beyond the upper waters of the Missouri and Mississippi, treat with powerful Indian tribes, and protect the fur-trade from the domination of Britain. He also had a large share in carrying into effect Jefferson's plan to remove the Indians west of the Mississippi; and made an elaborate report to Congress detailing the military roads and public highways already constructed by the States or Congress and proposing extensive work on internal improvements, which led to the Survey Bill that subsequently became a law.

Calhoun was no doubt the greatest Secretary of War until Jefferson Davis occupied that office. Besides the progressive legislation he originated or furthered, in five years he had cut down the debts of his department from forty-five to less than five million dollars, and the enormous losses by defalcation under the old subsistence system had practically ceased. A new spirit began to be infused into the Army when officers found that appreciation was the reward of the deserving. Watching closely the affairs of his department and making occasional trips of inspection, he came to know the personnel, and the latter in turn began to feel the reality of the War Office and the strong arm of the Secretary behind them in

matters of duty. Thus, both in the service and in the country at large Calhoun's popularity and prestige grew. . .

VII

A SYMBOL of the national unity was the rebuilt Capitol which Charles Bulfinch of Boston, whom Monroe had appointed to replace Latrobe, had reconstructed generally after the original plans of William Thornton except that the great dome was raised on a base and a low lantern set on top. Calhoun's efforts to unite and centralize his department were *en rapport* with the prevailing spirit. Unity was the political catchword of the day: Marshall was hurling forth his judicial decisions to strengthen the central Government; Monroe was contemplating his doctrine of America for the Americans, and peace and harmony prevailed within the Democratic Party . . . when the Missouri question burst forth as a flaming portent of the evil of sectionalism.

Fourteen years before the new territory of Louisiana had been cut into two parts, all south of the thirty-third degree latitude being called Orleans (later admitted as the State of Louisiana) and all north of that line being called Missouri (including the present State of Arkansas). On November 16, 1818, at the second session of the Fifteenth Congress, a petition was presented by Missouri, together with another from the southern part, known as Arkansas, asking for admission to the Union. In the following February a congressional committee reported a bill to enable the inhabitants to form a State constitution preparatory to admission; whereupon James Talmadge, Jr., of New York, proposed an amendment forbidding the further introduction of slaves into the territory, and another providing that all children born after the State's admission should be free at the age of twenty-five. Thus slavery, like a sleeping dog, leapt into the arena of American politics.

The opponents of slavery obviously had but two arguments

in their favour: that they were then the majority in Congress, and that they were anti-slavery. The proponents of slavery, on the other hand, had many arguments: Missouri was a part of Louisiana, and Louisiana had been slave-holding and had been promised that the institution in her territory would not be interfered with; most of the emigration to Missouri had been and would be from the South, and to abolish slavery there would deprive citizens of their property and hurt the State by discouraging further emigration; and finally – and this was the crux of the matter – that Congress had no constitutional right to lay any restriction on a territory for admission, for if it did, as soon as the territory became a state a legislative act would wipe out the restriction, and if this freedom was prohibited then that state would not be on an equal footing with the other States. And incidentally there was Maine – a part of Massachusetts – ready for admission as a free State, to be held off as a condition of Missouri's admission as a slave State.

For a year the debate continued to overshadow all other considerations in Congress. Henry Clay and William Pinckney of Maryland (the latter a great and powerful orator making a poor speech, according to Adams, "from the inherent weakness of his cause") ably fought the restriction; Rufus King of New York as ably defended it. So bitter were the feelings aroused, however, that at one time Randolph suggested to Clay that all the Southern members retire in a body from the House. Disunion was now heard on every hand.

Jefferson the slave-holder and staunch defender of democracy spoke for his party: he thought that slavery should be extended into the territories so that, by diffusion, the evil might be lessened. Four years before he had declared: "The hour of emancipation is advancing in the march of time. It will come; and whether brought on by the generous energy of our own minds, or by the bloody process of St. Domingo excited and conducted by the power of our present enemy

(Great Britain) . . . is a leaf of our history not yet turned over. . . That emancipation may finally be effected and its progress hastened will be the last and fondest prayer of him who now salutes you."

Adams, much concerned, called upon Calhoun at the War Office and discussed the matter till long after dinner time. Calhoun did not think it just to Virginia, who had ceded so much land to the Union, to exclude her citizens from the territories. However, "I do not think," he said, "that the question will produce a dissolution of the Union; but if it should, the South would of necessity be forced to form an alliance, offensive and defensive, with Great Britain."

"That would be pretty much returning to the colonial state," suggested Adams.

Calhoun admitted this to be true. "The South would be forced to such a course, however."

"What if the North should find itself cut off from its natural outlet upon the ocean? Would it fall back upon its rocks bound hand and foot to starve, or would it retain its powers of locomotion to move southward by land?" asked Adams.

"In that case," answered Calhoun, "the North would find it necessary to make their communities all military."

In March, 1820, when new members had swollen the pro-slavery ranks in Congress, the Missouri question was compromised by admitting slavery as existing in Missouri (as a part of Louisiana) but excluding the institution in any future territory north of Missouri's southern boundary line. The spirit of unity had triumphed again.

Except that the temporary depression of 1819—the collapse of credit caused by speculators having to give up by default the twenty to fifty thousand tracts of land they had been allowed to take up—had jangled the national nerves to some extent, the Missouri question had involved no economic antagonisms, and had never been anything but political in its purpose, so that it could be debated rationally as a political

question. Jefferson, however, saw in it a subtle danger. On April 13 he wrote: "The Missouri question aroused and filled me with alarm. The old schism of Federal and Republican threatened nothing, because it existed in every State and united them together by the fraternalism of party. But the coincidence of a marked principle, moral and political, with a geographical line, once conceived, I feared would never more be obliterated from the mind; that it would be recurring on every occasion and renewing irritations until it would kindle such mutual and mortal hatred as to render separation preferable to eternal discord. I have been among the most sanguine in believing that our Union would be of long duration. I now doubt it very much, and see the event at no great distance, and the direct consequence of this question." And nine days later: "But this momentous question, like a fire-bell in the night, awakened and filled me with terror. I considered it at once the knell of the Union. It is hushed indeed for the moment. But this is a reprieve only, not a final sentence. A geographical line, coinciding with a marked principle, moral and political, once conceived and held up to the angry passions of men will never be obliterated, and every new irritation will mark it deeper and deeper."

Although the proponents of slavery won vaster territory – Missouri and Arkansas as against Maine – and therefore an increased pro-slavery representation in Congress, it was doubtful if their gains were comparable to the victory of the anti-slavery forces in securing a compromise that at least asserted the implied right of Congress to legislate regarding the institution. Calhoun, though not a member of Congress at the time and therefore not assisting in the measure, favoured the Compromise, and did not regard seriously the usurpation by Congress of implied rights, having at the time such confidence in the Constitution as curtailing the federal Government that he was no stubborn supporter of the legal fiction of permanence and fixed forms, and was quite willing to grant a

certain flexibility of government. However, he did protest Adams's "wild tendency" towards consolidation, following the latter's complete acceptance of Clay's "American System"; and he realized only too well that Adams's objection to the Missouri Compromise was primarily because he wanted Congress to legislate *outright* against slavery *without* compromise.

President Monroe himself probably had some doubts about the precedent being established, for when in March the bill was sent to him for approval he summoned his cabinet and posed to them two questions for *written* answers: (1) Whether Congress had a constitutional right to prohibit slavery in a territory; and (2) whether the prohibition in the bill *forever* prohibiting slavery within certain limits was applicable only to territories or could extend to the States that might be formed therein.

According to Adams, the Cabinet agreed unanimously as to the first proposition, though Calhoun, Crawford and Wirt could find no express power to that effect in the Constitution, and Wirt expressed himself against any such thing as *implied* powers. As to the second proposition, Adams thought that "forever" would mean the State; but all the others denying this, Calhoun suggested that this question be altered so as to read whether the eighth section of the bill was consistent with the Constitution, thus permitting all the members of the Cabinet to answer simply in the affirmative, and to this the others agreed.

After the meeting Calhoun and Adams walked home together. Adams based his stand on the assertion of the Declaration of Independence of the natural equality of all men and of their inalienable right to liberty; so that the powers of government to be just must derive from the consent of the governed.

"The principles you avow are just," said Calhoun in substance; "but in the South they are always understood as applying only to the white race." He went on to say that

domestic labour was confined to the blacks, and such was the prejudice that if he had a white servant, his character and reputation would be irretrievably ruined.

Adams: This confounding of the ideas of servitude and labour is one of the bad effects of slavery.

Calhoun: True, but it has many excellent consequences. In the first place, it does not apply to all kinds of labour; for example, farming. I have often held the plough myself, and so did my father. Mechanical and manufacturing labour is not degrading: only manual labour – the proper work of slaves. The system is the best guarantee of equality among the whites, producing an unvarying level among them. It not only does not excite, it does not even admit of inequalities by which one white man can domineer over another.

Adams insisted he could not see things in the same light; and added privately: "It is not true. It is only perverted sentiment – mistaking labour for slavery and dominion for freedom. . . The discussion of this Missouri problem has bared their souls. In the abstract they admit that slavery is an evil, though disclaiming all participation in the introduction of it and cast it all upon the shoulders of our old Grandam Britain. But when probed to the quick upon it they show at the bottom of their souls pride and vain-glory in their condition of masterdom. They fancy themselves more generous and noble-hearted than the plain freemen who labour for subsistence. They look down upon the simplicity of a Yankee's manners because he has no habits of overbearing like theirs and cannot treat Negroes like dogs!"

Thus spoke the eternal Puritan: if slavery was evil, there could be no phase of it that was good; if liberty was mere freedom, then all men had a right to choose their particular slave-chains; if democracy was equality, then the lower-man must be punished by the successful for his failure to succeed. In such a creed there was no place for tolerance, liberty and compassion. For Adams, by the ascetic standards of his own soil, was a just man. . .

THE Missouri question was not quite ended with the compromise, for when this territory reported her constitution it was found to contain a provision forbidding the Legislature ever passing a law emancipating slaves without the consent of their masters, and another forbidding free Negroes and mulattoes from entering the State. Speaker Clay exerted all his power to secure the admission of Missouri on her own terms; and when Randolph moved for the reconsideration of one of the votes taken, Clay ruled him out of order and refused to recognize him until his name was called in the regular order . . . by which time the bill had been signed and sent to the Senate.

"I envy neither the heart nor the mind of any man from the North who rises here to defend slavery from principle," Randolph had declared; and gave the Northern members who had voted against the slavery restriction their future name—Doughfaces. No doubt the anti-slavery men were greatly puzzled to hear this assured aristocrat and slaveholder condemn an institution so near his life; but Randolph was consistent, and in his will freed his slaves and used his great fortune to buy land on which to settle them.

"It (the Missouri Compromise) is canonized in the heart of the American people, and no ruthless hand will ever dare to disturb it!" cried Stephen Douglas . . . who later did more than any one man to tear it to shreds.

Thomas Hart Benton—soon to enter Congress—summed it up as the "work of the South, sustained by the united voice of Monroe's cabinet, the united voices of the Southern senators, and a majority of the Southern representatives."

Calhoun had, as a matter of expediency, favoured the Compromise; and as a matter of principle, its spirit, deeming compromise the logical method of adjusting differences in a democracy. In August, 1820, when the third contest was looming, he wrote: "I can scarcely conceive of a cause of sufficient power to divide the Union, unless a belief in the slave-holding States that it is the intention of the other States

gradually to undermine their property in the slaves and that disunion is the only means to avert the evil. Should so dangerous a mode of believing once take root, no one can calculate the consequence; and it will be found that a re-agitation of the Missouri question will tend strongly to excite such a belief." And ten days later, writing Judge Tait of Alabama who had fears that a struggle was commencing between the North and South for superiority: "That there are some individuals to the north who, for private objects, wish to create such a struggle, I do not doubt. It suits their ambition and gives them hopes of success. . . But their number is small, and to be found almost wholly in New York and the Middle States. The great body (of the advocates for slavery-restriction) are actuated by motives perfectly honest. Very few indeed look to emancipation. . . We to the south ought not to assent easily to the belief that there is a conspiracy either against our property or just weight in the Union. . . Nothing would lead more directly to disunion with all its horrors."

Apparently Calhoun was trying to allay his own fears, for he knew that the slavery question had not merely been debated in the halls of Congress in connection with Missouri, but that almost every Northern State had offered resolutions through their legislatures condemning slavery in the territories, some even condemning it in principle and naming it as a crime (the same States which later were to make laws excluding free Negroes from their boundaries!). About a year later there occurred a slave-insurrection in and near Charleston led by the free mulatto Denmark Vesey, in the suppression of which evidence was uncovered showing that the language used to incite the blacks was *that used by Rufus King in the Senate during the Missouri debate.* The unsuspecting slaves had been taught to believe that the Missouri Compromise was really a private charter of liberties.

Nathaniel Macon had warned the South years before: "If Congress can make canals they can with more propriety eman-

cipate. Be not deceived. I speak soberly in the fear of God and love of the Constitution." Morals could not be surveyed like land; and from the time of the Missouri Compromise politics in America took a distinct departure and slavery became an important and finally a controlling factor, only giving way for a time to another critical sectional question — the combination of the tariff and nullification that was as economic in its original as it was political and constitutional in its ultimate expression. . .

VIII

One other event of great importance was to mark the unity of the Era of Good Feeling — the assertion of our national determination which came to be known as the Monroe Doctrine. Adams related that both President Monroe and Secretary-of-War Calhoun felt some apprehension as to the intentions of the Holy Alliance, thinking that the sovereigns who were party to that pact meant to restore to Spain her South American dominions and were then likely to attack the United States as the most conspicuous example of successful popular rebellion. In 1821 Mexico revolted against Spain and set up a new federative republic. Most of Latin America, following the Portuguese Revolution and the civil riots in Spain when the King was driven out and a Republic proclaimed, had already revolted — Venezuela and Peru like Mexico to form republics, and Brazil to crown Don Pedros as Emperor. The restless Czar Alexander, looking with an envious eye across the sea towards the lost world of the Spanish Empire, was annoying the Monroe administration with his ukases relating to fishing in the North Pacific and his implied threat to colonize the Pacific mainland to California.

Both Calhoun and Adams were opposed to Clay's mode of carrying out plans for the recognition of Buenos Aires or Chili, and they were also united in their wish to retain the

Amelia Islands – an agreement which led Adams to write many complimentary things in his *Diary* about that "captivating man" Calhoun. But when Calhoun expressed the desire that Cuba be invited to join the Union – in a roundabout way so as to avoid friction with England – Adams disagreed with him so decidedly that the matter was abandoned.

In the meantime the British Foreign Minister, George Canning, had proposed an Anglo-American pronouncement upon Latin-American affairs, and Calhoun thought that this should be taken advantage of in order to detach Great Britain from the Holy Alliance. Monroe, however, had already decided to act independently; and after Adams had rejected his bid, Canning generously persuaded Prince Polignac, French Minister at London, to secure from France a promise not to join in an expedition to reclaim the Latin colonies where there was still danger of an Allied invasion. The astute Monroe now had the stage all set, and Calhoun, to whom fear of the Holy Alliance was the main consideration, assisted the Secretary of State in preparing the document that was to express the new national determination of America, softening where he could the too effusive expressions of republicanism contained in Adams's drafts. . .

On December 2, 1823, the reading-clerk read to the assembled Houses at Washington a lengthy paper from the President that established a new pivotal point of American foreign policy – a paper that defied the Holy Alliance and established the new American doctrine: *America for the Americans! Europe, hands off this hemisphere!*

President Monroe's message was received with a burst of patriotic joy in America; in Europe with mingled feelings, delight in liberal circles, resentment in reactionary circles. Brougham, the Whig, asserted in the House of Commons that the message had dispersed joy over all the freemen of Europe. Canning claimed credit for the stroke that called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old.

Spokesmen for the Holy Alliance – Chateaubriand in France, Metternich in Austria – loudly denounced the doctrine and called for resistance. Realistic France openly jeered at a doctrine that lauded self-determination and yet aimed at imperialism (for, as a matter of fact, the doctrine literally barred any further territorial expansion by the United States); but in the end it was France's withdrawal of her troops from Spain, rather than the Monroe Doctrine, which cast the blight that withered the Holy Alliance forever.

IX

IT would be hard to say who coveted the Presidency more – John Quincy Adams or William H. Crawford. President Monroe, now a man of past sixty, a Revolutionary hero of strong pro-French sympathies who had assisted in negotiating the Louisiana Purchase, had little doubt that his re-election and the continuance of the Virginia Dynasty was a mere matter of formality; and as to what came after, he was more concerned with history than with men. But with Secretary of State Adams and Secretary of the Treasury Crawford the case was different: both were getting old – Adams was nearly the same age as Monroe, and Crawford but five years younger – and their great ambition was yet to be realized. Calhoun, too, had his eye on that great political prize, but on account of his youth he had no expectation of realizing his ambition immediately, so that his rivals regarded his aspirations with elderly indulgence. As late as 1821 he had evidently made up his mind to support Adams in order to combat any geographical division of the party such as might have followed the election of the Georgian Crawford, and Adams's *Diary* at that period is filled with eulogies of Calhoun with whom he took "long rambles," as it was filled with bitter phrases about Crawford.

Crawford noted this *rapprochment* between Calhoun and

Adams with growing hostility. A pleasant-faced, studious, amiable man of great wealth, Crawford's ambition was never that sordid brand which seeks to accumulate power as an end, but rather for the glory of leading a revolution against the growing spirit of conservatism and centralization similar to that which Jefferson had led in 1800. He was the acknowledged leader of the "Radicals," the largest political division in Georgia, numerous in the entire South, and influential in the North – particularly in New York under the management of that adroit politician, Martin Van Buren. The word, however, is not to be confused with the modern radical, smasher of the icons of the past, but rather to be understood in its proper connotation of proceeding from the root; for Crawford's radicals were Simon-pure Jeffersonian Democrats, strict constructionists to a high degree, and comprised a States' Rights party *par excellence.* Calhoun and Crawford lived not far apart in the South, and had been warm friends; but when the latter became convinced that Calhoun's progressive democracy was nothing but nationalism with its tendency towards ruinous government agencies, he turned against him with a ruthlessness that appalled even Adams. Undoubtedly most of the prying inquiries with which the Secretary of War was pestered as to matters in his charge, details of contracts, et cetera, originated with this capable Georgian. Some time later, one of Crawford's adherents in South Carolina managed to get into the Legislature despite Calhoun's vigorous opposition, and succeeded there in actually getting through some resolutions condemning the latter's nationalist policies.

Early in the political race, Crawford sustained a series of serious defeats in Georgia, his greatest enemy, with whom he had had a duel, having been elected to the governorship; and Crawford jumped to the conclusion that Calhoun and Lowndes had been encouraged by these rebuffs to try to supplant him. "Our Mars gets all the offices and is regarded as lord of the ascendant. Lowndes and Calhoun, regarding

me as *hors de combat*, suppose that the Southern interest will become the property of the first adventurers. Mr. Calhoun has made a tour of observation in Pennsylvania, while Mr. Lowndes kept watch at home."

When Crawford wrote this – in September 1821 – he was inaccurate, but not altogether wrong. At the time Calhoun still had no hopes of the Presidency for himself and rather favoured Adams's candidacy. But towards the last of the year the South Carolina Legislature, evidently feeling that Crawford's chances were poor, nominated Lowndes; and ten days later a deputation of congressmen called Calhoun from his lodgings at Washington to ask if he would allow his name to be used. Calhoun acceded, but immediately asked Lowndes if he ought to retire; whereupon Lowndes's answer was to write James Hamilton declaring that if enough States would support Calhoun, South Carolina would transfer her vote to him. The two friends continued their daily walk together to the Capitol.

From this time Adams's estimate of Calhoun underwent a rapid change. Although Adams was far too scrupulous to resort to malicious disparagement, he was Puritan enough to sanctify his motives even unconsciously; and so as a formidable rival Calhoun became a mere double-faced climber "professing friendship for the man he is hounding," and of "excessive thirst" to turn everything into instruments "for the promotion of his own popularity. . . Precedent and popularity – this is the bent of his mind. The primary principles involved in any public question are the last to occur to him. What *has been done*, and what *will be done* are the Jachin and Boaz of his argument." Possibly, too, Adams had foreseen this rivalry, for a year before, he was naively urging his colleague to accept the mission to France, telling him that he expected more from him than "from any man living for the benefit of the public service of this nation," and intimating that a residence in Europe would much enlarge his sphere of

usefulness. But Calhoun was not so easily got out of the way; his excuse for refusing the mission had been that he could not meet the expense.

Outside the cabinet, also in the hurdle-race for the Presidency, were Clay and Jackson. With the former Calhoun had already fallen out over the method of nominating Madison's successor, Clay having been unalterably opposed to the congressional caucus which Calhoun had finally accepted as an opportunity to support Monroe. Now their differences were further aggravated by the tariff question. The tariff of 1816 provided for reductions in 1819, but the year before the term was extended for eight years and the rates on unmanufactured iron increased, and Monroe indicated that further increases might be necessary. To this program the South was offering strong opposition, and Calhoun fell in with the policy of his section, consistently enough since he had supported the first tariff for a definite purpose and for a definite time; whereas Clay's predisposition was for protection and still more protection.

Jackson alone was the unknown quantity. One thing, however, was certain: his interest was in popular power rather than in details of policy, and it was obvious that he would make a tremendous appeal for popular support in every frontier State from Georgia to Illinois where the election cry, "Let the people rule!" was again being raised.

Who would win the hurdle race? The contestants were all of the same Democratic Party, so that personal interest, not loyalty to party, would influence the voters. Crawford was a Jeffersonian Democrat of the purest type; Adams really a Federalist of the traditional opposition. Calhoun was a progressive Democrat representing the agrarian interests of a united South and West; Clay was his counterpart representing the industrial interests of a united North and West. Monroe was a conservative Democrat of the period when the best people of the South had deserted the discredited Federalists; Jackson a radical representing the popular democracy

of the ever-advancing frontier. Here, then, was an outward unity with an inner conflict of spiritual and material forces ready for interpretation. American democracy was again at a cross-roads. Who should point the way to material progress with the highest-sounding spiritual justification?

Calhoun, Clay, Adams – each had his precise program comprehensively balanced on a platform, and each was equally sure of his cause and success. But human fate is not always decided by material necessity and spiritual conception. Sometimes the masses dream of escape from earthly inequalities for no other reason than that the primordial fears of nature have not been overcome; and he who articulates that human need and philosophical cognition acquires a magical power which enables him to lay a spell on millions and transform the aspect of the world. . .

In August 1822 Calhoun established his Washington *Republican*, with its motto *Libertas et natale Solum*, to combat the attacks of Crawford's *City Gazette*. The Philadelphia *Franklin Gazette* also came out for him strongly, and a movement was started by Democratic members of the Pennsylvania Legislature to put his name in nomination. In March 1823, an attempt to secure his endorsement by the State Convention at Harrisburg failed only because of the condition of State politics, two-thirds of the members being Calhoun men; but for that matter so did resolutions endorsing Jackson fail to pass. That year Lowndes died, and the South Carolina Legislature unanimously nominated Calhoun for the Presidency. Never had his chances seemed brighter. In his opinion Pennsylvania and New York were the joint key-note of the election: the former he was certain of, and the latter was promising with Van Buren and the Crawford forces obviously in confusion.

Crawford was now the only candidate favouring the outmoded congressional caucus. A meeting of Democrats in Lancaster had gone on record for a convention of delegates

from all the States in the Union for selecting the presidential candidate; and early in 1824 the Pennsylvania delegation in Congress published a notice asserting that they would not attend a caucus, a declaration in which a month later a hundred and eighty-one other members concurred in an announcement published in the Washington *Intelligencer.* As if in defiance, in the same paper appeared a notice signed by eleven members from various States announcing that a caucus would be held the following week. The caucus was held—Nathaniel Macon refused to attend, and the aged Jefferson refused to support it by a declaration—and proved to be a movement of Crawford's friends, mainly from New York and Virginia, to start a landslide for their candidate which they hoped the other States would join.

George M. Dallas, a candidate for the mission to Mexico, was the first to denounce the caucus, declaring it, at a Philadelphia meeting, to be the work of "a miserable and infatuated minority"; and enthusiastically endorsed Jackson. Calhoun saw the handwriting on the wall, and through his newspaper gracefully announced his tacit withdrawal from the race; whereupon the Harrisburg State Convention immediately nominated him for the Vice-Presidency. Clay, also realizing his chances were gone, switched his influence to Adams. The race was now between Adams and Jackson—but in either case, Calhoun was certain to be Vice-President.

The South—and South Carolina particularly—was in a dilemma. They feared the new popular democracy of the West, but at the same time they abhorred the industrial so-called democracy of New England. As a choice of evils, therefore, they chose Jackson, hoping that some good might come out of the continued union of the South and West. Even Calhoun was careful to keep nearer Jackson, denouncing the whispering-campaign of Clay and Crawford hinting at a coalition between himself and Adams as "a device of the enemy," and opposing more firmly the tariff of 1824 (now that he no longer needed the support of high-protectionist

Pennsylvania he could be more outspoken) that aroused much indignation in the South, and in South Carolina particularly, where the growing nationalism in general and Calhoun in particular were bitterly denounced. But in justice to Calhoun it must be said that his change of front was not entirely politic: he was always essentially a Democrat, and he realized that the present political drama was really, on a larger and a national scale, the same that had been enacted in Virginia, and later in South Carolina at the time he was first entering public life when the seaboard conservatives had feared its interests would be imperilled by the popular democracy of the upper-country. Jeffersonian democracy still lived in the country, and woe to that party which, by continued success, should become unwary in dialectic and uninformed in conditions, while the cautious desire to remain in power kept it conservative and (for the sake of protection) too nationalistic. . .

In 1824 Jackson received the popular vote and at once started for Washington where he expected to be inaugurated, only to find that Adams and Clay had entered into their "compact of bargain and corruption"—what John Randolph bitingly styled a "coalition between Blifil and Black George, the combination of the Puritan and the Blackleg"—whereby Clay was to be made Secretary of State in return for his influence in having the House, where the election had been thrown because no candidate had received a majority electoral vote, declare Adams the President. There was some hissing in the gallery when the choice was made known. Calhoun, of course, became Vice-President—a peculiar position for an opponent to be placed in, since he would logically be the centre of opposition to the new President.

Jackson, however, was far from whipped. With James Monroe he called on the new President at his F Street residence to offer congratulations, attended the inauguration ceremony in the old hall of the House of Representatives

with John Carroll and His Rotundity, the fat and fatuous old John Adams, and the ball in the Assembly Rooms . . . and soon afterward, labelling his fellow backwoodsman Clay the "Judas of the West," resigned from the Senate and announced his candidacy for 1828. Not caring very much about the honour before, he was now spurred into tremendous aggressiveness by indignation at the treatment he had received.

The dissension in the Democratic Party had its parallel in personalities. Webster, as might have been expected, refused a challenge from John Randolph; but the latter accepted Clay's challenge for calling him a blackleg. The participants met in a thick forest on the right bank of the Potomac—in Virginia, since Randolph had expressed a wish to fall, if that was his fate, on his native soil, even if he was violating her law.

The agreement was pistols at ten paces, no practice, *one—two—three—fire!* Colonel Tatnall, Randolph's second (the latter had wanted Benton who could not serve as he was a relative of Clay's wife, although he was present as a favourer of Randolph) obtained the choice of positions; General Jesup, Clay's second, the choice of weapons. When Tatnall was repeating the word as he intended to give it, Randolph's pistol was discharged prematurely. The latter's confusion was immense. In the excitement both gentlemen missed when the word to fire was really given.

"This is child's play," fumed Clay; and insisted on another fire.

Randolph let his adversary fire, then raised his own weapon. "I do not fire at you, Mr. Clay," he said; and aside to Benton, "I would not harm him for all the land watered by the King of Floods." He discharged his weapon and offered his hand. "You owe me a coat, Mr. Clay."

"I am glad it is no greater debt, sir," said Clay gravely.

That night Randolph entertained his party and presented each man with a gold piece for a shield. "It was the last high-toned duel," declared Benton.

The duel was symbolical enough of the almost imperceptible seam in the solid rock of the old South-West party; and though the participants compromisingly shook hands, the gesture was in the nature of a truce rather than the old unity, and there were no compliments passed. How different, in its expressions of admiration, was the eulogy which Webster delivered that year jointly for Adams and Jefferson! But then, these old opponents were dead. They had both died the same night, on the anniversary of America's Independence, July 4, 1826. . .

X

HAVING definitely aligned himself with Jackson, Calhoun as Vice-President in Adams's administration was in an awkward position; but he solved it by the impersonality and dignity of his stand. He was a meticulous presiding officer, always punctual and ceremonious; and the only criticism ever made of his conduct in that office was for not having curbed Randolph in the latter's bitter harangue against Adams and Clay, though for this he was toasted in South Carolina as the guardian of free debate.

"When," asked Webster some years later, "did Mr. Calhoun announce himself a States' rights man? I have already said that nobody knew of his claiming that character until after the commencement of 1825." And yet if Calhoun shifted his position, it was only that he might get a firmer stand upon the shifting foundations of political life. Politically he had always been as far from Adams as Massachusetts was from South Carolina, and temperamentally as far as the simile could be stretched. At first he had sincerely doubted the charges of bribery and corruption levelled against the President and Clay, and admonished against an organized opposition, advising that the development of events be awaited to see whether Clay would "place his relations and conduct towards the administration of him whom he had elected, above all suspicion." But when Clay later took office as Secretary of

State, and Adams adopted in its full extent the latter's "American System" of extreme protection for manufacturers, there was no longer any reason for doubt; and the opposition that followed was "greatly strengthened by the bold federal and consolidation doctrines avowed by Mr. Adams in his inaugural address, and by the wild measures of policy which he recommended."

It was apparent now that the South's only defence against the tariff lay in a sectional cohesion. Nor was this political unity without justification: deprived of their foreign markets, the South was becoming more and more depressed as to agriculture; and, moreover, always a solid unit by temperament and taste, the people were justly annoyed by the coercion to buy American manufactured products and the deprivation of those to which they had always been accustomed. And finally, they regarded the whole formula of protection as distinctly un-American and unconstitutional.

Another great point of Calhoun's divergence from his chief was that of slavery. Like so many prominent Southerners of the time he had no brief to offer for the evil. "Believe me, I am not a panegyrist of slavery," he said. "It is an unnatural state, a dark cloud which obscures half the lustre of our free institutions. But . . . would it be fair, would it be manly, would it be generous, would it be just, to offer contumely and contempt to the unfortunate man who wears a cancer in his bosom because he will not submit to cautery at the hazard of his existence?" Slavery was an evil, it was a disease; but it was an evil with which the South alone could deal, and the South had decided it was a disease which must work itself out in time. In the meantime, the system was embedded in the Constitution and in the law; therefore it was no crime as the legislatures of notable Northern states had intimated. Adams, too scrupulous to designate as a crime what was legal, justified his anti-slavery attitude by pretending that slavery had no legal status, apparently basing his belief on the Declaration of Independence rather than the

Constitution. Nor was this an isolated difference of opinion between two men independent of other considerations: like the tariff, it had reference to Southern property, thus dovetailing the two questions. If the South was to be united in defence of her property rights, let it by all means be upon the question of the tariff, which could be more easily kept within the realm of rational debate.

So much for an inevitable cleavage with the Adams administration.

As for his *rapprochement* with the President's opponents, "The contest of 1825 ended in an entire change of the political elements of the country," he wrote Jackson, "and in the new state of things which followed I found myself acting with many of the friends of Mr. Crawford, to whom I had been recently opposed, and opposed to many of my friends with whom I had till then been associated." In these changed conditions it was necessary to make a choice between Adams and Jackson, or their affiliations; and more conservative Southern States than South Carolina, and more partisan men than Calhoun, chose the Old General. It was not easy for such men as John Randolph and the other champions of the Tidewater oligarchy in Virginia to commit their cause to the democratic party of the Mississippi under the leadership of the "lawless" Jackson; yet this was what they did, Randolph, nevertheless, bitterly denouncing the whole movement of popular democracy as "a monstrous tyranny of King Numbers." Nor was the case different in North Carolina. There the bitterness between the seaboard aristocracy and the up-State section was just coming to a head, as it had in her twin state twenty-five years before. Nor was there any Indian or land question, as in Georgia, to draw their support to Jackson. Nevertheless, the aristocracy again proved their genuineness by self-sacrifice: not only did they make concessions to the growing western power of their own State (which any prophet might have seen would eventually undermine their own power) but they accepted Jackson and his Western

party contrary to their ordinary political interests. Judge Gaston, like Randolph, raised his voice against the new trend, declaring that the cry, "Let the people rule!" was fallacious, and asking, "What is then to become of our system of checks and balances?" (Even the weakened aristocracy of New England, who had their material fortunes in the now dwindling shipping business, appealed to the South for support against the tariff as well as against the dangerous principle of majority rule.)

In Georgia and South Carolina, however, resentment against the manufacturing interests completely overshadowed the fear of Jackson's democracy. In the former State, Adams's threat to send troops to enforce his orders had almost precipitated strife over the Cherokee question. While the arbitrary treatment of the Indians later came to be regarded with much sympathy, at the time land speculation was commonly regarded as good business just as speculative finance was a century later; and George Washington had himself manœuvred to get royal grants which he divided and leased, and Patrick Henry had not been averse to a little land-grabbing. Moreover, the Cherokees had declared themselves a state within the boundaries of Georgia, defied both local and national authority, and applied to the Supreme Court for recognition and support. It was all very well to talk about the poor Indian from a distance, but living close to him under these circumstances was another matter. Georgia, therefore, had proceeded on her own authority, and in defiance of Adams, to impose her laws on the Indians and imprison those who resisted. Crawford, who was still popular with the planters of his State, now abandoned his opposition to Jackson and joined forces with Calhoun.

In South Carolina, Robert Barnwell Rhett and William Smith were successfully leading a fight against the tariff and "nationalism." Senator Hayne yielded at once, George McDuffie, an upper-State representative, next capitulated, and finally most of the Southern members in Congress came over

to their side. But Calhoun was cautious: he had made an alliance with Jackson on the understanding that the latter, whose health was precarious, would serve only one term and be succeeded by Calhoun; but Jackson's stand on the tariff was *unknown*. It was best, therefore, not to say too much. To gain time he deftly suggested that a referendum of the tariff to the various States would solve the problem; and in any event it was best to wait until Jackson, himself a native South Carolinian, was elected (as he was certain to be), so that their utmost sacrifice would be only a little patience. Thus he avoided an open break, and brought the anti-nationalist party of his State to submit for the time being to "Jackson and Calhoun."

THE Vice-Presidency provided Calhoun with special advantages, the opportunity to conciliate and cultivate his former opponents, and the leisure to reflect upon and study the complex issues of the day without being forced to take a premature stand, as well as take part in public affairs and look after his neglected personal affairs. Randolph wrote after having been consulted on some minor affair and then taken home in Calhoun's carriage, "The Vice-President has actually made love to me!" Perhaps it was a seasonable opportunity for the brilliant Virginian to sow his seeds of thought in Calhoun's mind when the sun of reflection might bring them to fruition.

In 1825 Lafayette with his son made a tour of the States and received gifts of land and money from Congress (so soon after they had bickered with the ageing and bankrupt Jefferson over a paltry sum for his magnificent library!) before returning to France on Farragut's gunboat. At the opening of the Erie Canal, President Adams threw the first shovelful of earth (the only popular act of his one term). Webster delivered the oration at the Bunker-Hill celebration in Boston. . .

IT was during this period that Calhoun purchased the plantation at Pendleton which was to become his permanent home—

a commanding site on the Seneca River which he called *Fort Hill* from a nearby hill fortified by General Pickens (his cousin by marriage) to awe the Cherokees during the Revolution. Probably he chose this particular location because of his weak lungs, for the elevation was high, the wooded hills beyond stretching away to the foot of the Blue Ridge Mountains, while luxuriant fields of cotton and corn sloped down to the water.

During his vacations at home Calhoun usually found an opportunity to visit Charleston where he was beginning to enjoy tremendous popularity. Here the Unionist party was the strongest in the State, with such notable leaders as William Gilmore Simms, the poet and novelist whose *Atlantic* had recently been published, and who advocated in his *City Gazette* a national democracy somewhat after the pattern of that espoused in the *New York Enquirer* of James Gordon Bennett whose long residence in Charleston had led him to adopt a permanently sympathetic Southern point of view; Hugh Swinton Legaré, the learned and eloquent editor of *The Southern Review;* the brilliant and eccentric lawyer James L. Petigru; and many others.

The old city, with its expansive battery, magnificent residences, opera house, golf club, and race track, was a gay and colourful metropolis despite the bales of cotton and barrels of rice piled on the rickety wharves. Usually the gentry came to their winter homes in the city only for the pre-Lenten season of St. Cecelia balls (the concerts having been abandoned a decade since), Philharmonic recitals, Dancing Assemblies, and the colourful Race Week with its Jockey Club dances. Like New Orleans, Charleston was more French than it was American in the Northern and Western sense; and the old Huguenot stock, reinforced by the San Domingo exiles, still commemorated the glories of France and discussed the abortive attempt of Francis Huger to liberate Lafayette from his Olmutz prison. These cosmopolitan plantation patriarchs, accustomed to a purely libertarian community,

looked with contempt upon the orderly New England communistic factory towns with their minister, lawyer, schoolteacher, general store, cobbler, cabinet-maker, seamstress and miller – and prying; and even the great Northern cities where the best people's idea of hospitality was to offer guests their church pew, and social prestige was a matter of success, producing a middle-class rigidity of manners and pretentiousness such as accumulating crests with misspelt Latin mottoes.

Often educated abroad and extensively travelled, these Charlestonians particularly resented the tariff that not only injured their market but prevented the indulgence of their taste for foreign articles. In this Unionist and States' rights men were united, though they differed as to the means to be resorted to in combating the menace; and so far Calhoun had managed to keep in the good graces of both parties, since he was known to be a Unionist and yet had cast the deciding vote that had shelved the woolens bill of 1827. "The Southern States are not and cannot for a long series of years become a manufacturing nation," read a memorial drafted at Charleston about this time. "We have not a population equal to the cultivation of our soil, and the insalubrity of our climate forbids the hope that this deficiency will soon if ever be supplied by a population of white labourers. We will and we must continue to raise provisions, articles of the first necessity for man in every climate, and raw materials for the use and consumption of manufacturing nations. It is, therefore, pecúliarly our interest that our interchange with the world should be free; that the markets for the consumption of our produce should be extended as widely as the habitations of man. It is equally our interest that the articles we are compelled to consume should be procured on the most advantageous terms. . .

"To manufacturers we repeat we have no hostility. We wish them to share in the general prosperity of our country, and repose and flourish under its liberal protection. But we perceive in them no features which entitle them to partial

favours of particular privileges. Against a system, therefore, calculated to elevate one interest in a society to an undue influence and importance; against a system intended to enrich one description of citizens at the expense of every other class; against a system calculated to aggrandize and enrich some states to the injury of others; against a system in every aspect partial, unequal and unjust, we most solemnly protest."

XI

IN 1828 the Union received the greatest blow since its inception, while democracy recovered its greatest unity since Jefferson's revolution of 1800 – the former in the Tariff of Abominations, the latter in the election of Andrew Jackson.

GENERAL JACKSON chose New Orleans as the place to begin his campaign, not only because it was the scene of his greatest glory, but also because it was the one spot in the Southwest in which he was weakest.

January 8 – the thirteenth anniversary of the Battle of New Orleans – was set for his official reception. Sunday morning dawned darkly: symbolically, a storm was brewing in the north, and the line of steamboats that were to escort the hero to the battlefield were obscured by a heavy mist that at the proper time lifted like a theatre curtain to reveal to the cheering audience on the waterfront the striking setting: twenty steamboats dressed in gay flags, led by two lashed together, on the back gallery of one of which, the *Pocahontas*, the General stood with his lieutenants and the most prominent of the delegates.

Although past sixty, Jackson from the distance appeared much younger, for he was still unmarked by withering age, being of that rugged and vital type which grows gnarled rather than flaccid with time. There were the same intensely bright blue eyes, the same stubborn lantern-chin, the same wide forehead set off by a shock of grey upstanding hair.

He held his tall thin figure erect with an air of confidence refined from a tremendous male conceit by the intensity of his life, and bowed and waved towards the shore where the crowd surged over the tied-up flatboats laden with flour, corn, indigo, live stock, and Monongahela Whiskey, in an attempt to get a nearer view of him.

"Old Hickory!" they yelled hoarsely, their voices drowned in the continuous firing of artillery.

At the battlefield he made his address, and at night there was a grand ball at the Théâtre d'Orleans. A brilliant assemblage, the women in their gauze-trimmed satin dresses, high-waisted, full-skirted, low-necked, with gloves and slippers and fans tinted to match the trimming, their hair curled and perfumed, their lips and cheeks generously rouged, moved like an animated tapestry in Oriental silver and gold and bright colours upon the polished floor. High up, above the second tier reserved for the favoured quadroons (as beautifully and as expensively attired as the ladies below), hundreds of candles in their crystal chandeliers cast a sparkling glow of unreality over the scene. To some it was like a medieval court, hard and polished like the stones in the palace; but to others it was a golden circle upon whose magic skirts a thousand devils sat tempting innocence. . .

ADAMS might have used the government service for a party machine to further his campaign, but he scrupulously declined to do so. Fittingly climaxing his melancholy administration was the "Tariff of Abominations," as Senator Smith of Maryland named it, which aroused so much sectional bitterness between the North and South that, had not Jackson been engrossed in leading his revolution of the West against the East, he must have paused in the march of democracy to take sides.

The previous summer the Tariff Convention at Harrisburg had published the terms—*Protection!*—on which the North would in future support any presidential candidate, and these

terms Adams's supporters immediately accepted with the intention of forcing Jackson into the anti-tariff camp so that he would lose the support of Pennsylvania and the tariff States. But Jackson's supporters were too astute to be sidetracked upon a mere principle: then in control at Washington, they not only supported the tariff but wrote it, knowing that the South would vote for Jackson in preference to Adams under any consideration. The anti-tariff, or the Southern, men were now in a dilemma: in playing for the votes of the pro-tariff Democrats in the North they had consented to the presentation of the bill, and it was certain to pass in the ordinary course of events. Hence they conceived a scheme to save the Jackson party and at the same time defeat the bill, by putting "enough ingredients in the chalice as would poison the monster." That is, by including a high range of duties on raw materials needed in New England while manufactured articles were accorded scant protection, they assumed that the shipping interests and manufacturing interests of New England would vote against the measure, thus putting the onus of defeat on that section. This was fighting the devil with fire. To the consternation of the Southern members, however, New England voted for the bill and it was passed. Webster, who eight years before had denounced protectionism as unconstitutional, and only four years before had made his classical free-trade speech against protection, now changed his attitude to suit his constituents, preferring to give up a good argument rather than a good office, and supported the measure with all his eloquence. Van Buren, Jackson's manager, and Eaton, his lieutenant, both voted for it.

Thus, what began in 1816 as a defensive measure to stimulate industries over a dull post-war period and establish a diversified and balanced economy by creating industries strong enough to survive the dumping and revenge of nationalistic passions, emerged for the first time as a weapon in the hands of industries that aimed to grow fat without competition and finish by raising a host of vested interests always

prone to demand a little and then a little more protection. The rates being higher than any public needs required, and the act being due to political manœuvring, the triumph was that of protectionism rather than of tariff — a final vindication of the Hamiltonian doctrines after half a century of American democracy. Webster knew what the Southerners might have known: that the devil likes fire. New England was willing to pay a great deal for the establishment of the protectionist precedent.

John Randolph caustically declared the tariff to be "a pirate under a black flag, its only manufacture being the manufacture of a president." Benton, a strong Unionist at all times, declared, "I do not think we are indebted to the tariff for the fertile fields and the navigable rivers, and I am certain we are indebted to these blessings for the prosperity we enjoy." Calhoun, of course, voted against the tariff, and upon its passage immediately denounced the measure, though there was no evidence that he joined in the attempts of his colleagues to spread their protests on the records of Congress.

In the South it was everywhere denounced as a law which, harming one section of the country for the benefit of another, was calculated to disrupt the Union. No doubt the effect of the tariff in producing their poverty — even Calhoun wrote, "The tariff system if persisted in must reduce us to poverty" — and even their poverty itself, was greatly exaggerated, for the continuous emigration to the West and the falling rate of population contributed something to the former condition, and the South was only poor in comparison to her former great wealth and not at all in comparison with the other States. However, the tariff was distinctly unfair, and did produce much hardships; and under stress of feeling people do not qualify their reasons.

When Calhoun reached home that summer, the tariff question was completely overshadowing the national election. North Carolina declared through her Legislature that the measure was unconstitutional; Virginia, Georgia, Alabama

and Mississippi passed resolutions of protest; public meetings, organizations, and groups of all sorts in South Carolina flooded their Legislature with protests, memorials, resolutions, and petitions. The seam in the Union had widened visibly. "I hold the tariff will place the great geographical interests in hostile array and eventually make two of one nation," Calhoun wrote sadly.

He hastened to cast himself into the breach. To Duff Green, editor of the Washington *Telegraph*, he wrote: "The ground we have taken is that the tariff act is unconstitutional and must be repealed—that the rights of the South have been destroyed and must be restored—that the Union is in danger and must be saved." It was apparent to him that the only sane and patriotic course to take in the face of the great excitement and disunionist sentiment in his State was to secure at least general political control there so as to prevent too precipitate action, and then unite his forces with those of Jackson to effect some sort of relief. It was now too late for him to crowd Jackson out of favour; re-election as Vice-President was the best that was then attainable for himself.

Receiving leaders at his home, *Fort Hill*, he made no effort to evade the issue. There was no hope from Congress, he said, where there were fixed majorities in both houses in favour of the tariff system; and no hope from the Judiciary. Thus there were two possible remedies: one, the election of Jackson who if he was willing to bring to bear systematically and steadily the patronage which the protective system placed in his hands, might reduce the duties down to the revenue standard; the other a State interposition or veto of the law. Of the two remedies he advised that the State support Jackson, who, though not outspoken either for or against the tariff, was himself a Southern slave-holder and possessed the popularity to impose his will. No doubt Calhoun suspected—as the vote of Van Buren and Eaton on the tariff indicated—that little could be expected from Jackson whose bitter rivalry with Clay was such that to defeat him he would pay even the

price of a high tariff to hold together the West and Middle States. Still, the device served Calhoun in gaining time and preventing the South Carolina hotheads from going to extremes.

Asked to amplify his State interposition remedy in such form as could be presented to the Legislature which was to meet in November, Calhoun readily assented on the condition of secrecy in order not to complicate the matter of his candidacy for the vice-presidency. About half of the work dealt with the problem of the tariff and contained much sound observation on political economy about which Calhoun was exceptionally well informed. Then, since the point under specific discussion (the tariff) had a political as well as a constitutional significance, his argument proceeded along those lines. "Through the political connection with the North, by a perversion of the powers of the Constitution, the South has been stripped of the blessings of nature which have been converted to the advantage of the North; the tariff rears up a moneyed aristocracy making the rich richer and the poor poorer, and produces almost universal suffering in the South. On that great and vital point . . . the interest of the two sections is opposed, and the country is divided and organized into two great parties – the one sovereign and the other subject."

Thus it was necessary to check the power of a mere majority. "No government based on the naked principle that the majority ought to govern . . . can preserve its liberty even for a single generation." Construction of the Constitution could not be relied on for defence, for construction was unstable. Stability was to be found in the reserved rights of the States themselves; that is, sovereignty, which meant a right to judge whether delegated powers had been exceeded; and this "clearly implies a veto or control within its limits on the action of the general Government on contested points of authority, and this very control is the remedy which the Constitution has provided to prevent the encroach-

ments of the general Government on the reserve rights of the States" by which "effectual protection is afforded to the minority against the oppression of the majority." If the premise be accepted of the sovereignty of the people and the central and State governments alike being the mere organs of popular power as based upon the records of the Federal Convention, then certainly nullification was the logical conclusion. *We, the people* originally meant "of the several States" before there *was* a central Government, and the people's conventions framed and ratified the Constitution creating the general Government as their common agent. The ratification by any *State* bound all its citizens to obey the Constitution, though some of them individually may have opposed it. The purpose of any constitution was at once to empower and *restrain* the general Government; and if the latter should exceed its powers against the will of the people of a State, then it was within their legitimate power by means of a convention (though not by act of the legislature) to declare the congressional act null, and to require the State government to prohibit enforcement within the limits of the State.

Such was Calhoun's "State Interposition or the Veto," or nullification, to cure the "great defect in our system" and sufficiently guard the "separate geographical interests." Calhoun did not originate the doctrine—which had been expressed clearly in the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions maintaining the right of a Sovereign State to annul distasteful laws (the Alien and Sedition); in the Resolutions of the Massachusetts Legislature in 1809 declaring Jefferson's embargo measure "oppressive, unjust and unconstitutional, and not legally binding upon the citizens of this State"; in the 1811 Faneuil Hall Resolutions (Boston) declaring against the Non-Intercourse Act in approximately the same language—and his part in the drama was merely to articulate and make coherent the understanding inherent in the democracy of his section as well as, in a vaguer degree, elsewhere. Nor

did he force his followers into the nullification camp any more than the more impetuous leaders in his State forced him to take the stand. The greatest extent of his influence at the time was his example.

In July, Calhoun wrote Monroe (probably in the hope of eliciting some encouragement from him): "One thing seems certain, that the system is getting wrong, and if a speedy and effective relief be not applied, a shock at no long interval may be expected." In his reply, however, Monroe "deeply regretted the trend of Southern proceedings, thinking them fraught with danger, for the Southern States are deeply interested in the preservation of the Union which would otherwise suffer from frightful insurrections of the slaves." Monroe had characteristically again changed his mind, and moreover, he was getting old and, like Jefferson, wanted peace; but at any rate he had frankly expressed the fear of many others — that while secession was not the logic of nullification, nevertheless it might easily become the exaggeration of nullification.

This fallacy Calhoun felt it incumbent upon him to disperse. On the premise that the Constitution was a compact between the States, nullification, or the disavowal by the principal of the act of an agent, was logically deduced; but disavowing the act of an agent did not mean the dissolution of the partnership: on the contrary, it might make the agent more just. Therefore, nullification was not destructive but conservative of the Union, and constituted the only peaceable way of insuring the stability of the general Government. "Where there are important separate interests, there is no alternative but a veto to protect them *or the military to enforce the claims of the majority interests.* . . . It is the Constitution that annuls an unconstitutional act. . . Any court may proclaim such nullity, but the people of a State retain similar power which no federal agency may override. Indeed, the general Government in all its branches must acquiesce in such declaration of nullity so far as enforcement within the State is concerned; or as an escape it may apply to the

other States to obtain a grant of the disputed power in the form of an amendment to the Constitution." In other words, if the veto should be unjustly used, three-fourths of the States could override it by giving the federal Government, by amendment, authority to pass the vetoed act. "But if such amendment should fail of ratification, no alternative would remain for the general Government but a compromise or its permanent abandonment. Nullification would give no ground for a clash of arms; it would be a conflict of moral and not physical force, a trial before courts and juries. The rights of nullification and secession inhere in the sovereign States; but the two programs are poles apart in their purposes and effects. The object of secession is to withdraw as a member from the Union, while the object of nullification is to confine the general Government within its prescribed limits of power in order to *perpetuate the Union on an equitable basis.* Nullification may indeed be followed by secession in case a proposed amendment should be ratified by the sister States to such effect as to defeat the object of the Union so far as the nullifying member is concerned. The power of nullification, therefore, tends to weaken the general Government; but the power of amendment is an adequate offset. The two powers establish a system of mutual checks, in effect a system of government requiring agreement by concurrent majorities in critical issues, and as such it is the line which genuinely free institutions have followed since the Tribunate in ancient Rome. Such a system which inheres in the federal Constitution as thus interpreted maintains the ascendancy of the constitution-making authority over the law-making: the concurring over the absolute majority. It maintains a power essential for liberty and the general welfare to compel the parts of a society to be just to one another by compelling them to consult the interest of one another."

"I do not claim for a State the right to abrogate an act of the general Government," Calhoun wrote Governor Hamilton. "It is the Constitution that annuls an unconstitutional

act. Such an act is of itself void and of no effect. What I claim is the right of the State as far as its citizens are concerned to declare the extent of the obligation, and when such declaration is binding on them."

In November the South Carolina Legislature met. In his message the Governor spoke of the tariff as "a palpable violation of the Constitution and the law of the land," but warned the members against any plan which would "separate the interests of this State from those of the other suffering States." Resolutions employing the gist of Calhoun's report were adopted and sent to the other States. A few favourable replies were received, but the response even from the Southern States was far from satisfactory. Ohio admitted the right of a State to nullify an unconstitutional federal act, but strongly denounced any State's right to secede. Several thousand copies of Calhoun's report were published and distributed under the title, "Exposition and Protest reported by the Special Committee of the House of Representatives." In a short time it became famous as "The South Carolina Exposition," though its authorship was not known for several years.

Though the connection between the tariff and slavery was not generally obvious, it must have been in Calhoun's mind when he declared in his report that even if the South should turn to manufacturing "the North would make war on black labour for taking the bread out of the mouths of Northern wives and children." Randolph (who immediately labelled nullification as "nonsense") had always been considered irrational or "rambling" because he invariably drifted from any discussion of the tariff into the subject of slavery; but now any ordinary grasp of complex relations enabled one to see the connection between the tariff, capital, labour, and slavery. The tariff bound organized labour to capital by promising what the former was now coming to demand as an organization—the reduction of working hours, better pay, and tax-conducted schools. The first gun for labour had been fired

the preceding year at Philadelphia when six hundred journeymen carpenters threw down their tools and demanded the rights of freemen to live as humans and not as slaves. Specifically they fought for a ten-hour instead of a fourteen-hour day; but generally they were fighting for their citizenship, for leisure in which to participate in political and public affairs: their next step, class-consciousness, was as yet obscured.

Here, then, in addition to the rich profits to be culled from the tariff system, was an opportunity for industrialists to justify the long hours and low pay of their wage-slaves by putting the blame on the South, and at the same time forge another weapon against the slave-economy. "How can you expect better pay," was the retort to Northern workingmen, "when the South gets her labour for ten cents a day?" Thus the latter's ire was turned into abolitionist channels. Where this was not enough to absorb their belligerency, there were always the sops of the franchise to make them feel "free," of the common school to make them feel "equal," and of the machine to make them feel "scientific."

The uses of manufacturing industry, unlike those of the agrarian, are mutable, and their form follows the design. Already in the North there was a pronounced sentiment that to question the tariff was to question native industry, and to question native industry was to question patriotism. English textiles and French perfumes thus became a national menace; belief in free trade was treason. And so, in the North as a whole (except for the dwindling shipping interests and desiccated aristocracy of New England which raised a feeble protest) the song of the tariff became a national anthem. Henry Clay, in whose disreputable "American System" the tariff played so prominent a part, was ready to boast: "For the sake of *my* system"– a system, incidentally, that was old even in Madison's time – "I would defy the South, the President, and the devil." The *Friends of Domestic*

Manufactures held a convention at Harrisburg and applauded the victory of the tariff. The *Factory Workers*, a communistic organization of workers in the usual state of grace, held meetings and voted to send a beautiful carved chair to their patron saint from Massachusetts, Daniel Webster.

The latter was the guest-of-honour at a public dinner given by the *Chronicle*, self-styled "Friend of Manufacturing," at Faneuil Hall on June 5. The old "Cradle of Liberty" was appropriately decorated with evergreens and the national flag. Bunting and evergreens fell from the centre of the high ceiling in festoons. Opposite the main entrance were pictures of Washington and Faneuil and a bust of John Adams encircled with a wreath of flowers. Over the door was a great legend, *Our Country, Our Whole Country, and Nothing But Our Country;* in the background a shearing-machine symbolizing manufacturing, a ship symbolizing commerce, and a plow symbolizing agriculture; while decorating the sides were banners of various societies and military companies. Five hundred guests were present and thirteen toasts drunk, the last to "our distinguished guest, worthy of the noblest homage which freemen can give or a freeman receive, the homage of our hearts!"

Affable and majestic, sure of his following and therefore of himself, Webster rose to speak eloquently of "other paramount considerations," and took occasion to berate all who hated New England. The burden of his speech was "Be not narrow-minded!"

"I was not at liberty,"—thus he justified his support of the tariff—"to look exclusively to the interests of the district which I have heretofore had the honour of representing. . . To render the Constitution perpetual (which God grant it may be) it is necessary that its benefits should be practically felt by all parts of the country and all interests. East and West, North and South, must all see their own welfare protected and advanced by it." . . .

WHILE the tariff was being respectively denounced and acclaimed in the South and in the North, the electoral revolution was proceeding with a bitterness and intemperance only equalled by that of 1800. Over and over the charges of fraud and corruption were made and Adams held up to scorn as a President not elected by the people. Jackson's marriage to his beloved invalid Rachel, which had unfortunately taken place before her divorce had been legalized (though afterward corrected), was duly publicized—"the basest, meanest scandal that ever disgraced the image of God!" the Old General branded it—and the Democrats retaliated with a story of how Adams when in Russia had sold a beautiful American girl to a nobleman. In the rural South and West girls wore calico aprons and dresses imprinted in great medallions with the heads of Jackson and Calhoun.

Van Buren was managing the Jackson campaign: his former leader, Crawford, stricken with paralysis, sat like a tragic Tantalus on the bench where he had been placed the year before, contemplating sorrowfully the delights of activity he had loved so well. Benton had patched up his quarrel with Jackson (which had started many years before through a duel between James Benton and Colonel Carroll and culminated in a tavern brawl at Nashville in which pistols, a cane-sword, and a dirk were used, and in which one man fell downstairs, Benton in a panic fired his revolver and then presented his trouser seat as a target for Carroll's gun, and Jackson was wounded), and now, with his friend Sam Houston who had been elected Governor of Tennessee the year before, was representing Jackson to the West as a Messiah. The Charleston *Courier*, the Washington *National Intelligencer* and *Gazette*, the New York *Post*, and the Richmond *Enquirer*, indicated that the messiah's reign would be a veritable millennium.

Webster and Clay were, of course, supporting Adams in the nationalist wing of the party, not with any hope of immediate success or even from any motive of loyalty to their candi-

date, but rather in an attempt to preserve the scattered remnants of Federalism till such time as they might be gathered in. William Henry Seward of New York, Adams's political advisor in 1824, indicated he would throw the whole strength of his Anti-Mason Party to the latter.

Now that the Federalists were learning how easy it was to establish tyranny by merely calling it *The People*, they were taking the cue for their future sporadic comebacks. "The true source of power is the people," declared Webster. "The Democrats are not democratic enough: they are real aristocrats. Their leaders want to govern by a combination among themselves. . . Go to the people and convince them that their pretended friends are a knot of self-interested jobbers who make a trade of patriotism and live on popular credulity." Jackson, whom in 1824 they had found too lowly for the Presidency, they now denounced as too aristocratic. Had he not travelled to Washington in a coach-and-four with his slaves, like an aristocrat? Through party journals which now made their appearance – *We, the People*, and *The Anti-Jackson Expositor* – each side labelled the other miscreant; but since slogans turn upon a false connotation of mere words or upon crude personalities, each side merely labelled themselves in their opponents' eyes.

It was not surprising that Adams received all New England's electoral votes. But those were all. The votes which four years before had been split among Crawford, Clay and Jackson were now all given to the latter. Significantly enough, New York and Maryland divided theirs. The South and West went solidly for Jackson. In rural districts in Tennessee the men who voted for Adams were hunted down and tarred and feathered. Calhoun was elected Vice-President by only a smaller vote than that given Jackson.

On December 23, 1828, the anniversary of the beginning of the Battle of New Orleans, a great banquet was arranged in Nashville for the victorious candidate which had to be cancelled on account of the death of his wife the night before.

Delaying only long enough to build his wife's tomb and to plant four willows near her grave, Old Hickory began his long journey to Washington, a band of crepe on his arm and a miniature of his beloved Rachel about his neck.

At the inauguration Jackson rode alone (emulating his father's example, Adams had refused to greet his successor and left Washington before the ceremony) in an open carriage from Gadsby's Hotel, attended by a company of officers and soldiers of the Revolution, all of whom entered the Senate Chamber where Jackson replied to the address made at the hotel, alluding to his companions as the companions of the immortal Washington. The ceremonies were then adjourned to the East Portico where John Marshall presented the Bible and administered the oath. Amid the booming of cannon and the cheers of the multitude Old Hickory shook hands with hundreds of admirers, only a stout ship's-cable stretched across the front and sides of the platform preventing him from being carried away bodily. At the public reception mobs stormed the White House, stood with muddy feet on the satin chairs, smashed china, and cheered their new leader. Tubs of punch were placed on the lawn to lure outside the lusty adherents of the President (who was rescued through a smashed window) to the less destructive pastime of trampling the shrubbery. Numerous fights occurred, brought on by the excess of animal and ardent spirits; even the women had bloody noses. There was no official ball, but President Jackson dined with Vice-President Calhoun and other friends at the White House on a sirloin steak cut from a prize ox sent from the Franklin Market in New York.

XII

President Jackson completely shared the belief of the still-submerged common people that he was a messiah come to establish the millennium of Democracy; and at once he made it clear that he purposed to maintain his superiority by

keeping all others on a lower level, pretty much as Henry VIII, that lusty precursor of modern nationalism, established his own divine rights by democratically reducing the nobility to futility. Office-holders were promptly removed wholesale; and though Senator Marcy of New York revived the Greek slogan *To the victor belong the spoils* as a justification, all men knew that the procedure was simply to punish those who had not shouted lustily enough for the Leader, and that the system must eventually establish a precedent for local organizations to intrigue against the popular will. Senator Edward Livingston of Louisiana, who had been to Jackson in the War of 1812 what Hamilton had been to Washington in the Revolution, had been suggested as Secretary of State, but this important post went to Van Buren as the highest reward for his services in the campaign. Van Buren, with John H. Eaton of Tennessee (Secretary of War) and William T. Barry of Kentucky (Postmaster General), constituted the wing in the cabinet partisan to the President. Calhoun—or at least his friends—had done his utmost to keep the first two out of the cabinet; and it was J. A. Hamilton, the son of Alexander Hamilton, who persuaded Van Buren to take over the State Department on the ground that "Calhoun now hopes Jackson may be thrown into his arms by your refusal." Calhoun's opposition to Eaton was unfortunate because it was unessential, the latter being an unimportant figure; and moreover Eaton was a personal friend of Jackson, and to that sentimental old warrior personalities were at least as valid as precision in government.

The others in the cabinet—Samuel D. Ingham of Pennsylvania (Secretary of the Treasury), John Branch of North Carolina (Secretary of the Navy), and John M. Berrien of Georgia (Attorney General)—looked to Calhoun as their chief.

At first, however, this division troubled Jackson very little, as he looked about for a privy council of his own choosing that could be depended on to echo his personal opinions—

his famous "Kitchen Cabinet" made up of a nondescript group of clerks and newspaper editors, namely, William B. Lewis, Frank P. Blair, and Amos Kendall, all significantly enough from his own West.

In his inaugural the President had declared for "a strict and faithful economy," and on the burning issue of the tariff that "the great interests of agriculture, commerce and manufactures should be equally favoured, and that the only exception to this rule should consist in the peculiar encouragement of any products of either of them that may be found essential to our national independence." The South, where some hope had been found in this utterance, was disappointed in his first message to Congress which was not only vague and non-committal on the subject of the tariff, but, in recommending the distribution of surplus revenue after payment of the debt among the States, rather hinted that the source of the revenue, or the tariff, would be retained. This sop to make the tariff popular was to Calhoun and his section not only fatal as a policy but insulting to the South's position. Again, when Jackson vetoed the Maysville Road Bill in May 1830, Southern hopes were again aroused, it being felt that if the expenditures were reduced the temptation to maintain the tariff would be lessened; but again their hopes were dashed by Jackson's second message which reiterated his attitude towards distribution of the revenues among the States and some further misty remarks about the tariff.

Calhoun now realized in dismay that he had helped elect to the Presidency a man whose belief in his own attributes transcended that of the most ardent Federalist in a "monarchical" head, and whose narrow conception of democracy as constituting the national soul and material welfare of the common people enhanced the danger of nationalism more surely than the most energetic industrialism could ever accomplish. Clearly, though the success had been achieved by the Democratic Party, the real victory belonged to the new West in the triumph of popular democracy – the first logical step

towards that industrial democracy which must be the goal of the increasingly powerful middle class to whom any sectional compromise would always be inadequate for the development of "business." That the common people in their collective wisdom might have known just what they were voting for could not have been clear to the logical mind of Calhoun to whom the fact that men serve subtle ends which they oppose as immediate ends would have been an impossible paradox.

In his opinion the time had now come to unite not only South Carolina but the whole South ere its political power, based upon a dwindling population, should wane, against the progress of a system that must eventually strangle its economic structure. This unity could only be effected in defence of its property; slavery not yet being a vital issue, there remained the tariff as an issue. Next in importance to the unity of the South was the latter's union with the West. In the meantime there was a lull in the tariff quarrel—while the leaven of the "Exposition" worked. The fires of sectionalism were not flaring so brightly as they had a decade before, but only because they were more general, steadier and stronger. . .

An innocent resolution offered in the Senate by a member from Connecticut looking to the limitation of the sale of Western lands, was the poke that stirred the embers into new flame. Senator Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri, now the acknowledged spokesman of the administration, leapt into the arena to demand the object of the resolution, accusing New England of attempting to check emigration in order to minimize the competitive power of the West and to keep their poor at home for slavery in the factories. Foot's resolution had not been even remotely connected with the tariff; but after the mention of factories the question of protection logically followed, and Benton went on to show that such protection taxed the South in order to injure the West and to pauperize the poor of the North so as to enrich the indus-

trialists; and ended by asserting the hope of the West lay in a solid phalanx of the South and those scattering reinforcements in the Northeast which had formerly saved the infant West from being strangled at its birth.

Here, the Southern members saw, was an excellent opportunity to break any alliance of the North and West. Calhoun's understudy, Robert Y. Hayne – who had supplanted Judge William Smith in the Senate after the latter's bitter attack on Calhoun's "nationalism" some years before – now emerged in the battle. He began by criticizing the policy of the Government in reserving the public lands for revenue which aided consolidation, one of the greatest evils. He compared this narrow policy with the liberality of England, France and Spain; and finally showed that it was in reality an attempt to preserve factory labour. "Sir, it is bad enough that the Government should presume to regulate the industry of man; it is sufficiently monstrous that it should attempt by arbitrary legislation artificially to adjust and balance the various pursuits of society and to reorganize the whole labour and capital of the country. But what shall we say of the resort to such means for this purpose? What? Create a manufactory of paupers in order to enable rich proprietors of woolen and cotton factories to amass wealth? From the bottom of my soul do I abhor and detest the idea that the powers of the federal Government should ever be prostituted for such purpose!"

Here, in the opinion of Northern politicians, was a serious situation. There was enough truth in the assertions of Benton and Hayne to require the most adroit handling, and enough danger in the South's bid for Western support to demand the swiftest action. Their most capable man to handle the situation was clearly Webster who lost no time in entering the lists. Unable to speak against Benton – though he had twice attacked New England and with much more force and vigour than Hayne – lest that give colour to a struggle between the North and West, Webster cleverly chose Hayne

as his target and proceeded to arraign the South (and South Carolina particularly) for lack of patriotism, thus converting the whole issue into one of nationalism against States' rights. At the end of his first speech he moved the postponement of consideration of Foot's resolutions, an artful move in itself as the vote would probably have contradicted his statements as to New England's love for the West.

Hayne now denounced Webster for attempting to interpose another between Benton and himself, between the West and New England where the issue belonged. He recalled Webster's inconsistency in the matter of the tariff, and asked if it were possible that Mr. Webster's sectional interests were paramount to those of the whole nation. If so, why should he impugn the sectional interests of Missouri or South Carolina? He then proceeded to flay Clay's "American System" that was meant to create a reciprocal distribution of government favours East and West, while the South, "Yes, sir, the impractical South!" was to be out of its protection. He accused Webster of having with the tariff crossed the border and made war on the South; reviewed the history of Federalism and national republicanism (which he declared to be one and the same) and looked upon the Constitution as forming not a federal but a national Union. "The federal Constitution is . . . a compact by which each State, acting in its own sovereign capacity, has entered into an agreement with the other States, by which they have consented that certain designated powers shall be exercised by the United States." He then proceeded to review the history of South Carolina and of Massachusetts from the Revolution to the Hartford Convention, and asked who were the friends of the Union – those who were willing to allow each State its liberty and prosperity, or those who were constantly usurping the States' power to add strength to the central Government which could then regulate the capital and industry of the whole country and thus serve that portion of the Union which succeeded in dominating the central Government.

"The doctrine that the federal Government is the exclusive judge of the extent as well as the limitations of its power is utterly subversive to the sovereignty and independence of the States. *It makes little difference whether Congress or the Supreme Court is vested with this power.*" If the federal Government in any of its departments can fix the limit of its own authority and the States be bound to submit to its decision, then the States were reduced to mere corporations and the government was made one without any limitation of powers.

Calhoun as presiding officer was, of course, unable to take part in the debate, but no doubt he had carefully coached Hayne in the matter, and Webster probably knew this. Moreover, Calhoun's authorship of the "Exposition" was now generally suspected, so that Webster's speeches were indirectly aimed at the Vice-President. Though Calhoun and his school had never maintained that the Constitution was an agreement between the States on the one hand and the federal Government on the other, but rather that historically the States were the only parties to the Constitution and the United States was the result or derivative or agent for certain purposes of the States (such as a partnership that results from the agreement of its members), Hayne had made the mistake of referring to the federal Government as *one* of the parties. Since he had previously correctly stated the doctrine, the error was a mere slip of the tongue; but Webster now seized upon this slip and with all the finesse of a great debater held it up to scathing ridicule in his short speech which closed the debate. He maintained that the federal Government like the State governments was a popular government, the agent of the people and not the creature of the States, and that the people alone had the right to control it.

The debate was strikingly like a battle by single combat in which prowess, rather than historical accuracy and fair reasoning, was the criterion. No more striking representatives could have been chosen: the forty-year-old Hayne, aris-

tocratic (like Calhoun he was of an upper-class family, who had twice married into the wealthy aristocracy), cultured, fluent, warm, his face animated by the intensity of his convictions, a fearless revolutionary after the Eighteenth Century cosmopolitan model; the six-year older Webster, of sturdy yeomandry stock, ambitious, capable, strikingly majestic in his blue coat buttoned neatly over his white cravat and full stomach, debating clearly and tellingly in a monotonous voice, knocking his opponent's argument full of holes and then advancing his own with such subtlety as to make each point tell.

That Webster was illogical, historically inaccurate, and inconsistent was perfectly apparent to Calhoun and Hayne, and probably to Webster himself. There was little consistency in his claim that the people had established republican governments in their States and then proceeded to establish a federal Government over the States which denied the latter their republican liberties; or in other words, that nullification was certainly no less a revolutionary device than would be a dogma maintaining that the Constitution established a monarchy. But Webster was the new type of man, able to match with expediency the changing mood of his times, and ready to sacrifice consistency to take his stand on the growing popular conception of the Government, at the same time retaining his hold on the masses through the vulgar love of the ornate. His grand manner of triumphant conviction made the very rules he broke seem petty; and the fire of his great lustrous eyes and the melody of his deep musical voice accomplished what dialectics could never have accomplished and carried his hearers along with him to the point of enthusiastic agreement . . . even if on thinking it over afterward they decided it was all too good to be true. "No man," was the saying, "can be quite so great as Webster looks and speaks."

The debate lasted four months and was suddenly dropped. Each side claimed the victory; but undoubtedly Webster had

gained a valuable point in identifying his local prejudices and interests with Union and Southern interests with disunion. Thereafter puritanic Northern industrialists and sentimental Western nationalists might use the central Government to advance their interests with the clear conscience of being—patriotic. . .

THE issue between nationalism and States' rights was now an open sectional conflict. For the time being Southern leaders were admittedly the aggressors, being determined to press the radical question of States' rights (on which their future safety depended) while they still had the strength in the national council.

Calhoun was now the accepted spokesman of the latter party. Jackson had so far not committed himself, but Calhoun was not unduly hopeful about the President's attitude on which so much depended. He well knew the old General's disposition to believe in himself so utterly that any personal disagreement with him was opposition to what was *right*. Moreover, the States'-rights doctrine, subordinating the federal power and minimizing the Executive's importance, would be distasteful to Jackson so long as he himself was the Executive.

But if Jackson was uninformed in abstract ideology and distrustful of logic, at least he hated individualistic capitalism; and possibly his course might have been more moderate but for the bitter personal quarrel with Calhoun about this time—his being the type of mind that resolved quarrels into personalities and personalities into principles, or vice versa.

Peggy Eaton, the wife of the Secretary of War, was the rag-and-bone of the contention. The daughter of a Washington inn-keeper, a witty, vivacious and elemental girl who refused to recognize the restraints of the times, "Pothouse Peg" or "The Harpy of Degradation," as the ladies of Washington inelegantly dubbed her, had made herself notorious before her marriage to John Eaton, and the matrons and

clergy of the City promptly turned thumbs down on her social life. Jackson immediately took her part: not only was Eaton his personal friend, but his own beloved Rachel—who had herself suffered from such malicious gossip—had thought well of Peggy. He practically ordered his cabinet members to accept her. The bachelor Van Buren complied; but Mrs. Calhoun, a recognized social leader at the Capital whose example would have been unquestioningly followed by others, had no intention of being dictated to by a frontiersman who had merely appropriated the graces of an aristocratic background and established himself as a gentleman-planter without any conception of the amenities from which those graces sprang. To the seaboard aristocracy the picture of the young Jackson who had set out from Hillsboro to Nashville on a race horse, packing a brace of duelling pistols (but no sword), trailing a pack of hunting dogs, and conveying his one slave (a girl), was an amusing one of a back-country dandy; and though he had established himself in politics as a nabob, he remained an egalitarian who, merely reversing the Puritan concept of reducing all to the level of the common people, would raise all to the level of the aristocracy. Mrs. Calhoun, therefore, ignored both Peggy and her defender; and the more Jackson raged, the more striking was her silent scorn. When a hundred members of Congress threatened to resign and the "Eaton Malaria" menaced the government itself, Van Buren saw that it had gone far enough, and he persuaded Eaton to accept the Governorship of Florida and subsequently the mission to Spain. Mrs. Calhoun had won in the encounter. But her husband had lost, for Jackson never forgot the insult. . .

MEANTIME the nullifiers were growing impatient for a showdown lest their doctrine dwindle into a mere anachronism of political opinion such as had happened to the Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions and the various nullifying resolutions of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts. Confident now that

Congress would do nothing to lower the tariff, the nullifiers began a vigorous agitation in South Carolina for a State convention where the people "in their sovereign capacity" should decide what ought to be done. They adroitly kept nullification in the background, basing their campaign on "States' Rights" and "Free Trade," and formed clubs of this name everywhere in the State. Robert J. Turnbull, editor of the inflammatory *Crisis* in which he inveighed against everything nationalistic and centralizing, warning the South that these unconstitutional methods would ultimately be turned against the institution of slavery, cried: "Look again at Georgia! She has not once but twice vanquished the federal Government, and so will it be with us!" Nullification Clubs sprang up everywhere in the State; sympathizers wore blue cockades, the emblem of State sovereignty; Nullification Dinners resounding with sensational toasts and speeches—and even Nullification Balls—were organized to propagate the doctrine. The Unionists of Charleston, a small but prominent minority, retaliated by dubbing the Clubs "Jacobins" and addressed patriotic appeals to the *Citoyens* and *Landsleute* to resist the secession spirit. The eccentric wit, James L. Petigru, a staunch Unionist, declared: "I am devilishly puzzled to know whether my friends are mad or I beside myself. . . That we are treated like slaves, that we are slaves in fact, that we are worse than slaves and made to go on all fours, are stories that seem to me very odd and make me doubt whether I am not under some mental eclipse since I can't see what is so plain to others." All of this, however, was mere academic debate, the ultimate fate of mental formulations not backed by action. What was needed was a start towards drawing party leaders into apparent approval of vigorous resistance to the tariff.

The anniversary celebration of Thomas Jefferson's birthday, April 13, seemed a propitious occasion, when eulogies of Jefferson, the father of nullification, and praise of Virginia and Georgia for having championed States' rights might be

patriotically identified with the nullification doctrines. The commemorative dinner at Washington was, of course, the great event of the celebration; and the nullifiers set about getting control of that affair so that they might turn it to their uses. Subscription tickets were issued and extensively sold for the occasion.

At five o'clock the guests began to arrive at the *Indian Queen Inn:* the President and Vice-President; three of the secretaries of departments, Van Buren, Eaton and Branch; Postmaster-General Barry; members of the Houses; and numerous citizens. The air was charged with intensity, and as the dinner progressed a contagious uncertainty was transformed into subdued excitement.

Jackson sat at one end of the table and Calhoun at the other, eyeing each other suspiciously while the other guests watched them. In appearance the two leaders were curiously alike, somewhat in the same way as the outward form of the political party they represented. Both were tall and thin, with great heads covered with thick graying hair that stood up porcupine-like; both had thin, ascetic faces and bright blue eyes derived from their common Scotch-Irish ancestry; both had wide, generous mouths. But as one studied them one could detect that their resemblance was in features rather than in expression. Jackson's face with its heavy upper lip and long teeth expressed sentimentality and cruelty and sensuality; Calhoun's thin fluted lips denoted compassion and purpose under such control that he seemed like "a cast-iron man who had never been born." Jackson's eyes under stress of feeling dartled a steel-grey light; Calhoun's deepened to a dusky hue that was almost black. . .

When time came for the toasts General Hayne made a speech lauding Jefferson, and stated that the South Carolinian attitude was that of the old republicans of Virginia, and that Georgia had carried those principles to victory in the controversy about the Indians. Two-thirds of the toasts that followed repetitiously lauded States' rights despite the fact

that the President had written his own – in accordance with the custom – on the regular toast-list: "Our Union – it must be preserved!"

Before Jackson could announce his toast, however, Hayne left his place at the table and approached him with the request that he insert the word "federal," to which Jackson had no objection inasmuch as the toast he had previously prepared, written on the back of an old envelope in his pocket, after a conference with Van Buren, had read as Hayne requested. At the proper time the President rose, lifted his glass, and looking straight at Calhoun threw down his famous challenge:

"Our federal Union: it must be preserved!"

There was a subdued applause, then a dead silence as everyone waited to hear what Calhoun – whose turn came next – would say. Van Buren, short and plump, stood on a chair the better to see and hear.

Calhoun did not hesitate in taking up the challenge. White of face, his eyes black, he rose and hurled back his answering challenge:

"Our federal Union – *next to our liberties the most dear!*"

The effectiveness of the brilliant epigram was somewhat marred by the addition. "May we all remember that it can only be preserved by respecting the rights of the States and distributing equally the benefit and burthen of the Union!"

Isaac Hill hastily began a harangue from a text in Job. "*Democracy, wherefore do I take my flesh in my teeth and put my life in mine hand? Though he slay me yet will I trust him.*" But no one listened. The President rose and left the table, going over to a corner of the room where he stood talking with Van Buren. The guests began to gather in clusters, whispering, then talking loudly. As soon as they could manage it they drifted away.

The dinner was a complete fiasco so far as its original

purpose was concerned; but at least it had forced Jackson to put his cards on the table.

Shortly afterward another incident occurred – engineered by the scheming Van Buren – which completed the rift between Jackson and Calhoun and gave the final blow to the latter's aspirations to the Presidency as Jackson's successor. Crawford, whose dislike of Calhoun had not lessened with the years, was visited by the ebullient J. A. Hamilton who secured a statement from him to the effect that it was Calhoun, and not he, Crawford, who had pressed for Jackson's court-martial at the time of the Seminole War. This letter was now turned over to Jackson who in a rage forwarded it to Calhoun with a cryptic note demanding an explanation.

Calhoun was not caught off guard. On one occasion a letter from Monroe to him had been stolen and given to Jackson; and on another occasion Hamilton had attempted to get a written denial of the Seminole incident from Calhoun, apparently to catch him in a lie, at which time Calhoun had written Monroe to the effect that he feared some plot was afoot to embroil them both with Jackson.

But now the whole matter had to be met squarely. He had been strictly correct in his criticism of the insubordinate General, and he had no intention of trying to escape the difficulties of the situation by a lie. His reply to Jackson was, therefore, truthful and restrained. He frankly admitted that in the Cabinet he had first maintained that Jackson's conduct should be investigated – was any general to be above investigation under all circumstances? – but added that the cabinet councils were not for the object of bringing together "opinions already formed, but to form opinions on the course which the Government ought to pursue after full and mature deliberation," and that it was accordingly the duty of members to present their doubts and objections. He went on to say that his arguments were met by others "growing out of a more enlarged view of the subject as connected with the con-

duct of Spain and her officers." The vital point was that after due consideration the cabinet had unanimously (and that included his own vote) decided that Jackson was not to be court-martialled. But to Jackson, his Vice-President's mere frankness was an affront: the important thing was that Calhoun had dared to criticize his acts! In this Calhoun showed himself to be too scrupulously sincere for an astute politician; thus he was no match for Van Buren and Hamilton, two of the most ruthless politicians of the time.

The controversy ran on, and by the beginning of the next year (1831) the fact that there was a breach between the President and Vice-President could no longer be hidden. Again Calhoun erred in publishing a pamphlet to justify his conduct, though he had had the courtesy to submit the manuscript first to Jackson and Eaton had approved it with some changes. Duff Green, editor of the *Telegraph*, championed Calhoun's cause, and it was rumoured that for this reason he would be replaced in the "Kitchen Cabinet" by Blair of the *Globe*—Jackson's "Blatant Voice of the People." Soon the President was referring publicly to Calhoun as an "ambitious demagogue . . . who would sacrifice friend and country, and move heaven and earth, to gratify an unholy ambition. . . What must a moral world think of a man so perversely prone to secret lying as John C. Calhoun?"

"You know," Jackson wrote his friend Judge Overton, "the confidence I once had in that gentleman. . . I have a right to believe that most of the troubles I have had to encounter since my arrival in this city have been caused by his friends. But for the present let this suffice. I find that Mr. Calhoun objects to the apportionment of the surplus revenues among the several States. He is also silent on the bank question, and is believed to have encouraged the introduction and adoption of the resolutions in the South Carolina Legislature relative to the tariff. I wish you to have a few numbers written on the apportionment of the surplus revenue. It is the only thing that can allay the jealousies arising between the

different sections of the country." Jackson might defy the nullifiers but he was apprehensive about the movement.

Calhoun, exasperated by Jackson's personalities, in turn began to attack the "upstart martinet in the White House." It was even rumoured that a challenge had passed between him and Van Buren; that his partisans in the cabinet would be ousted and their posts filled by Northerners. Anything was possible now that the test of patriotism was unquestioning loyalty to the central Government, and the test of loyalty was a matter of attachment to the person of the President. Whether a reconciliation could have been effected had it not been for Van Buren and J. A. Hamilton (and of course Crawford) was purely speculative; but Calhoun was not too proud to make overtures to Jackson that were almost successful, and Jackson though obstinate had made up worse quarrels with others. Had that happened, Calhoun would surely have been the next President. It was, therefore, to Van Buren's interest to keep the quarrel alive and to keep Jackson attuned to the necessity of an alliance between the West and the Middle States in order to defeat the Judas Clay. . .

WHAT would have been the effect on history had Jackson and Calhoun not quarrelled and the latter had become President of the United States? Would he have been able to reinforce the Union and save it from the destruction which came a decade after his death? How far does faulty human logic affect questions of infinite magnitude or control vital matters? Are vast subjects involving the welfare of millions ever decided by the syllogistic methods of the forum? Are human events so infinitely contingent that they transcend the influence of even the greatest individuals? Were Jackson and Calhoun merely the incarnations of conflicting forces whose word would have better become abstraction than flesh? But people incarnate their ideals and aspirations in men, and reasonably so if men are regarded as the highest product of their own history.

The origin of both men was similar: both came from the same stock, from the same section, and from the same class — for though Jackson was not of the aristocracy, his family was good Presbyterian stock, and he had spent his boyhood at the house of a wealthy uncle amid slave-owners, land-speculators, horse-breeders, and the holders of local offices and titles. The assertion that Old Hickory was an illiterate radical was no more than the disparagement of disgruntled enemies. He had had only a superficial common-school education (Washington had had no more) so that his opinions tended to furnish rather than discipline his mind; but he was naturally shrewd, had excellent taste, and was as quick of tongue (and therefore of thought) as he was of temper. A simple activist and empiricist, his best qualities had made him what he was: a great soldier, an honest and dignified citizen, a loyal (if sentimental) friend, and a king who had not lost the common touch.

Where Jackson was instinctive, restless, perverse, and zestful of life, Calhoun was pure, poised, restrained, and inclined to the introspective life. No tavern brawls, women, and duels had entered into the latter's life, though he was passionate and certainly less puritanic (using the connotation of that word as implying censoriousness rather than personal purity) than Jackson. Indeed, Jackson's ready acceptance of the Puritan concept of Elected Man was no more or less than his acceptance of his *own* glory as a man, a not uncommon masculine conceit. Consequently, Old Hickory's standard was a personal one; his honour, to be well thought of by other men: hence his rugged individualism and honesty in impoverishing himself to pay his creditors, and his equal savagery in avenging any reflection on his own or his Rachel's character.

Calhoun's standard, on the other hand, was not so much to make himself as his class well thought of; and to make his politics powerful not merely because that advanced his ambition but because they were right in principle. Thus, in

advancing principles he felt himself in the right only as he advanced them: the honour he served was a code greater and more binding than the personal honour and honesty of individual man, and he regarded personal loyalty as both sentimental and puerile in that it required only pretence to make it seem real. To him the problems of civilization were always more pressing than those of the frontier: emigrants were naive and infantile adults seeking to escape problems rather than find greater ones; and he viewed any intentional return to nature as nothing short of calamity. Complex and passionate rather than simple-minded and quick-tempered; cold to intimacy and a polished conversationalist rather than a gregarious mixer; generous and compassionate rather than great-hearted and kindly; given to introspective rather than objective research — he was a laic contemplative in his recognition of the omnipotence of destiny, an aristocrat in his respect for idealized images, and a true patriot in his struggle to preserve an equitable democracy as the repository of the coming generation's faith.

The spectacle, therefore, of the nationalistic Jackson, who once with the bigwigs had attempted to set up a separate western Spanish republic, lecturing the cosmopolitan Calhoun, who had always been a staunch Unionist, on inconsistency and lack of patriotism, was a dangerous one if convincing . . . and convincing it certainly was to men who indiscriminately limited the ideology of democracy to the boundaries of the nation, and extended their ideals beyond the national boundaries to advance the empire. For in principle, the abstract ideal of democracy embodied in the watchword of France — *Liberty*, *Equality*, *Fraternity* — must, to be rational, be interpreted rationally as a whole, without emphasis on sectional economic or moral significance; whereas in practice, each section of America was putting the emphasis upon a different word: the South upon Liberty, the North upon fraternity, and the West upon equality.

New England might talk about liberty but her watchword

was *Fraternity*, whose purpose, when separated from liberty, included a sound thrashing for any brother failing to feel fraternal; the reason therefor being less a matter of ideology than a determination to change the social order to conform to her way of thinking, closely following the English industrialist conception of the social order as national with religion as an adjunct thereto and human rights and liberal practices those duly proscribed by the common law.

In the West, equality was used interchangeably with democracy, first in the social field by pretending that mediocrity and superficiality were the proper democratic substitutes for aristocracy and versatility, to compensate for the general poverty and uniform inferiority of her people; and second in the economic field, where the West was more concerned with federal paternalism than State liberty, in that the former not only aided prosperity and expansion and protected life and property, but also attempted to improve the moral and intellectual conditions there. Thus Western democracy passed progressively through the social and economic stages before it reached the political – exactly reversing its order in the South – and met New-England democracy halfway. Western egalitarianism, providing the desert in which New England might plant her weeds of thought, and New-England fraternalism, providing the teachers to give a godly flavour to materialistic success and place the right emphasis on education as a substitute for equality, thus combined in a neo-Puritan moralism against Southern libertarianism. Against these odds the South had the alternative of competing by expansion for the balance of power (in which case she must abandon her emphasis on liberty), or seeking insularity in sectional cohesion (in which event she would be overwhelmed by the new democratic or numerical majority). . .

WHAT with England expanding into Australia and New Zealand, France into Algiers, Russia into Siberia, and all three into America, and America in turn expanding westward, there

seemed to be an unprecedented mass movement, enlarging the earth and developing a new mass-democracy, which could not be stemmed. In the natural effort to replace man-shortage and to cover a vaster area with barter and exchange, invention was both an intellectual expression and a spiritual impulse to try new things to conform with the impetus of that mass movement. A growing demand had necessitated increasing mass-production in England and New England which in turn required more and improved machinery, a larger supply of staples, and better transportation. Governor Clinton's dream of a waterway connecting Lake Ontario with the Atlantic had been realized with the opening of the Erie Canal, giving the Northwest an outlet to the sea at one-tenth the old freight rates and transforming New York City almost overnight into a great seaport. River and canal steamboats had, since Fulton's and Livingston's failure to secure a monopoly of the invention based on the former's experiment in the Hudson River two decades before, become a commonplace with the *Independence* plying the Missouri River from St. Louis to Chariton, and the *Virginia* the Mississippi River to Fort Snelling. Six years before a sidewheeler had sailed from Savannah, Georgia, for England, thus marking the first crossing of the Atlantic by steam. Following the inauguration by the Liverpool & Manchester Rail Road of steam-cars for land transportation, the Baltimore & Ohio had incorporated three years before. The Cumberland Road, employing a Scotsman's idea of crushed stone for paving, had eight years since inaugurated a new era in road-building. Who could tell? – perhaps machines for propelling vehicles on those roads, without tracks, might some time be invented. Or, if the French continued with their advances in aeronautics, even air transportation was not improbable.

Optimism – belief in the coming millennium – was the keynote of Yankee and Western faith. In the past twenty years manufacturing had increased ten times in New England where mass-production would soon require a hundred thousand fac-

tory workers. Farmers, reduced to poverty there, were forced to become industrial workers or emigrate to Ohio; but the community was more than compensated for that loss by the production of muskets alone. In the past year a young man from Wayne County, New York, had been visited by an angel with golden tablets on which were inscribed the laws of the Latter Day Saints; and in this short time Joseph Smith had won hundreds of converts to his sect. Ignorant and incapable of theological speculation, Smith had taken a popular idea on the wing—the idea emphasizing the individual as the central fact in the spiritual universe, and the right of individual judgment to hold sway—and carried it to its logical conclusion. Polygamy being natural to man, polygamy was the natural marriage. The Mormon was the spiritual brother of the rising school of New-England intellectual-naturalists: both were determined that there should be a new earth for the new age.

In the South, where realistic pessimism was the natural heritage, this new trend was regarded with dismay. While the increase in manufactures had increased the cotton output by three (planters had practically abandoned tobacco, indigo, rice, and other products, for the staple), the tariff threatened to curtail imports of Southern purchases abroad and hence to curtail the foreign purchase of cotton. Thus the South would be dependent on the Northern market. Since only cotton could satify the textile demands, and only the South could grow cotton, obviously this staple would be a powerful weapon in the hands of the latter—provided she retained control of it. Would they sacrifice their interests to use this weapon for justice, or would the planters sell it for a mess of pottage? Hamilton, in his *Report on Manufactures* (the "text-book of the rich versus the poor") had practically assured the country that self-interest would triumph. But even if the planters remained true to their ideology, of what avail would that be without the liberty to practice it? Already the free-States recorded a population of seven million

against six million in the slave-States – and of the latter only three and a half million were white voters. In the past two decades New York City had doubled its size to two hundred and fifty thousand, while Charleston had remained stationary at thirty thousand.

XIII

CONVINCED that Van Buren was the marplot of the Administration, Calhoun attacked him openly; and now the whole country knew that not only was the party divided but that the two wings were irreconcilable enemies. In April, after the adjournment of Congress, Jackson asked for the resignations of Calhoun's friends in the cabinet. Calhoun and Hayne returned to their State to advise their constituency to resist the tariff, since both the President – "an ungrateful son of Carolina" – and Congress had, during two years, refused all relief to the suffering planters. For that matter, not one of the problems, the solution of which had been the purpose of Jackson's election, had been settled: the East had defeated Benton's land program; internal improvements as a national policy had only been toyed with in the Maysville bill (to build a highway to Lexington, Kentucky – Clay's home!), and the President had merely dallied with the great tariff question. As Calhoun said, all the great interests of the country had "come into conflict, and even the most resolute knew not how to proceed."

Jackson's new cabinet included the protectionist Edward Livingston, a wise jurist and a close student and disciple of Madison, as Secretary of State in place of Van Buren who had resigned for appearances' sake (slated, it was thought, for the Court of St. James); Louis McLane of Delaware, a conservative party leader of protectionist views, as Secretary of the Treasury; Roger B. Taney of Maryland, a former Federalist, and a capable and sincere jurist, became Attorney General; while Lewis Cass, as Secretary of War, was the only Western

man in the body. Although Jackson's advisory council were supposed to reflect his views, it appeared that the new Cabinet was as strongly for the bank as the old one, so that the President still had to rely on his "Kitchen Cabinet."

On his way home from Washington, Calhoun attracted much favourable attention – "unanimous, with the exception of a few dependent editors and their immediate partisans" – which encouraged him to believe that though the other Southern States would not join South Carolina in a movement, they would fall in line once the issue had been made. "I do not fear to carry the whole South with me, acting as it becomes my duty, which I will take care to do. I never stood stronger. I have the strongest assurance of a decided and successful support in Virginia, which in the present state of things is all important." No Southern State, Unionist though she might be, would ever permit federal troops to cross her ancient lines to do battle against a sovereign State.

At Columbia he stopped to confer with party leaders about the coming presidential election. Believing that Jackson was daily losing popularity, and that anyhow he was too old and too unwell to change his mind about accepting a second term, Calhoun was still optimistic about defeating Van Buren whom it was now certain Jackson had chosen for his successor. It was possible that the Anti-Masons, so numerous in Pennsylvania and New York, might turn the scales in the election, and Duff Green had gone there, where he had much influence, to electioneer for Calhoun. The more reflecting tariff men were not disposed to support Clay lest he go too far with protection; but hating Jackson, to get him out of office they would take Calhoun even "with nullification on his head." However, it was best for the South to stand uncommitted on the presidential question, and concentrate on those principles for which she must contend. The great sectional interests could be reconciled by common concessions, and if necessary the Constitution could be amended to avoid questions of constitutionality. If this failed, then disunion was

inevitable – but disunion was preferable to the existent system of plunder, "the most despicable of all possible forms of government." Calhoun's immediate object, therefore, was to throw himself entirely upon the South "and if possible to be more Southern than ever." Thus, in advancing her principles, the South would advance him in the only way in which he desired to be advanced.

However, Calhoun's early support of the tariff and other principles of "nationalism" had not yet been entirely forgotten in his State, and moreover the latter was more intent on advancing her doctrines than the career of any man; so that when Duff Green wrote James Hamilton, suggesting that some sort of *rapprochement* could be effected with the manufacturers in order to secure their support of Calhoun's nomination, Hamilton indignantly replied that "in no shape lot or scot would we be included in the arrangement . . . and I am quite sure that Mr. Calhoun's prospects are as hopeless as his ruin would be certain if he was brought to give his countenance to such a compact. . . We shall go on and not abate one jot in our zeal in the support of our principles, which we shall sacrifice to the elevation of no man on earth."

Calhoun's *Exposition* might have sufficed to justify his patriotism, but his authorship of that document was still not widely known. Indeed, his ambition made him err to the extent in which he was actually engaged in the movement. "Be silent," he wrote James Hammond in May, "in a great measure as to myself, except defensively, where you think justice requires it, but speak freely of men and measures as far as they bear on principles that we deem sacred." Such a policy was bound to be construed as lack of frankness; and so in July he felt constrained to explain his views in a public letter which he called an "Address on the relation which the States and general Government bear to each other," in which he declared that he yielded to none in love of the Union – being "too national" had, indeed, been considered by many, even of his friends, as being his greatest political fault – in

respect for the maxim that the majority should rule, and in attachment to the Supreme Court. The purpose in each case was to make more palatable what he was about to say against the actual conditions. He was anxious to intrude as little as possible on the public attention; and wishing to avoid the harshness of referring to the Northern and Southern sections, he substituted "the stronger" and "the weaker" sections.

Then followed a more complaisant rewriting of the *Exposition,* stressing the Virginia Resolutions (the support of that State was always most desirable to him, as the keystone of Southern support), and showing that the word *interpose* employed by Virginia meant *veto* or *nullify*. "This right of interposition, thus solemnly asserted by the State of Virginia, be it called what it may . . . I conceive to be the fundamental principle of our system, resting on facts historically as certain as our Revolution itself, and deductions as simple and demonstrative as that of any political or moral truth whatever. . . I solemnly believe it to be the solid foundation of our system and of the Union itself." Nothing could be clearer than this in regard to his stand.

The gravamen of his argument was, however, the tariff; and this he set forth with great clearness and moderation, appealing for a fair system before "excitement and anger should drive out reason and bring in violence." He attacked the protectionists' plan to perpetuate the tariff system by inaugurating a policy of national extravagance and then seduce the South into supporting both protection and extravagance by distributing the surplus revenue among the States.

"Mr. Calhoun's address was like a shock produced by a cold bath," declared Duff Green. "But for the cry of nullification he would have been nominated by the Anti-Masons. . . His friends believed he would denounce the doctrine because they supposed he knew such a stand would promote his popularity; and without knowing the man or examining his position they were shocked to find that he had not availed himself of the occasion to make himself popular."

"I know I am right," said Calhoun. "I have gone over the whole subject with more care than I ever did any other; and I feel that I cannot be mistaken."

The South Carolina nullification movement had now moved a step beyond similar previous movements in other States. For the present that sufficed, though the price of cotton was falling and the tribute to the manufacturer under the law of 1828 was becoming more and more burdensome. But the new Congress might give relief. If that failed, then *applied* nullification must follow. . .

THE new Congress met in December 1831. Clay was in the Senate; Webster and Benton were again in their places, and John Quincy Adams was just beginning his long career as a member of the House. In the meantime Jackson, having grown stronger and younger on a diet of power, had forgot all about being too infirm and old for a second term, and Van Buren had persuaded the New York *Courier and Enquirer* to voice the public demand for Old Hickory's re-nomination, and pressure was brought on the Pennsylvania Legislature (which twice refused) to renominate him.

With his re-election in mind, therefore, the President sent in a non-committal message on the burning questions of the tariff and bank; and Clay, taking its cautious tone as timidity, became more arrogant. Calhoun earnestly tried to dissuade the Kentuckian from pursuing his "American System" too far; but Cláy, who just that month had been nominated for the Presidency by an enthusiastic convention of his followers, was too intoxicated with his prospects to listen. William Wirt had been nominated by the Anti-Masons, and it was assumed he would draw many supporters from the Democrats, particularly in Virginia where Jackson was none too popular. Clay was certain he would be the next President. Never did prospects seem so bright for the new tariff and bank party. They had a large majority in the Senate and in the House, and the industrial forces of the country were being efficiently

enlisted and organized. A director of the bank—John Sargent—was on the ticket for the Vice-Presidency. Even if Jackson was re-elected, the party would still have control of Congress.

When, therefore, the cotton and tobacco interests presented once more their demand for immediate downward revision of the tariff, Clay roughly brushed aside the cautious Adams and again defied "the South, the Democratic Party, and the devil." The revisions made in the tariff were of no consequence. Having challenged Calhoun to do his worst, Clay now arrogantly pressed upon Jackson the question of renewing the bank charter. Under his instructions the president of the bank, Nicholas Biddle, hitherto inclined to settle matters in a friendly way with the President, offered a memorial for the renewal of the charter (although the old one was not due to expire for some years). That is, the bank men thought Jackson was losing ground, and they chose to take their chances with the party of the future.

Here was a chance for Jackson, who already had the backing of a tremendous numerical majority, to make concessions to the new business enterprise of the country and thus ensconce himself, or his party, in power for a long time to come. Already business enterprise had outstripped agriculture in the amount of capital employed in the mines, factories, and urban property: the planters in the South and Southwest, producing staples for which greater outlets had to be found in Europe, were fighting a losing battle. Even disregarding the advantages of opportunism, the other side of the picture would have discouraged a more timid man. With the danger of a strong secession from his party in the South, and with Clay and Webster leading the solid ranks of the industrialist East, any opposition to the bank now might be fatal to Jackson's impending campaign.

In May when the Democratic Convention—the first national convention ever to be held, marking the inauguration of a new device for democratizing the executive branch of

the Government – assembled at Baltimore and nominated him to run against Clay, Jackson took stock of the situation. New England was lost to him under any circumstances. New York, though for the bank, was grateful for his having opened American ports to British commerce, and his promise to uphold the tariff would draw her forty-four votes to him. In the South (as his nomination at Baltimore proved) he was still the popular candidate. He was convinced that the nullification sentiment was restricted to South Carolina; and even if the latter purposed throwing away her votes (on John Floyd of Virginia) she would not cast them for his rival Clay. Georgia (which Adams had insulted by threatening to send an "army" there to defeat the purposes of a popular governor) and Alabama were particularly grateful to him for his vigorous removal of the Indians to the Great Plains beyond Mississippi, Arkansas and Iowa (an act Chief Justice Marshall had declared unconstitutional, thereby eliciting from Jackson the laconic remark, "John Marshall has made his decision, now let him enforce it!"), which had resulted in a gigantic land-office business in the huge tracts of land which were sold for a minimum of $1.25 an acre, "cash or war-script."

The "Old West" – Kentucky and Tennessee – was Clay's territory, but even there the sentiment was strong for Old Hickory whose popular democracy was more agreeable than Clay's and Webster's new-fangled industrialist brand. The Southwest, peopled mostly by Carolinians and Virginians, was solidly for him. In the Far West he was equally popular, for although his veto of the Maysville Road Bill had temporarily put an end to the development of transportation under national auspices, he had renewed the Agreement of 1818 with Great Britain (whereby the disputed territory of the Northwest had been jointly occupied for ten years) for an indefinite period, and traders were flocking to the Montana Valleys, and trappers and missionaries as far as the Snake and Colorado Rivers. The past year the American Fur Company had been established, and the completion of Fort Leaven-

worth inaugurated a regular traffic with the Santa Fe country. Steamer service was in operation up the Mississippi River as far as Council Bluffs with the prospect of making further progress each year. Now that the greedy-eyed emigrants were making frequent passages across the Great Desert (which had been made into an Indian reservation because it was considered useless for anything else), the myth of its uselessness was beginning to evaporate, and practical men had reason to believe that Jackson would not be squeamish about letting Indian rights stand in the way of Progress. Methodists and Congregational-Presbyterians were re-echoing the old "Cry from Macedonia" and urging that the future fate of America lay with those who should send westward the seeds of morality and education which would make the new lands conform to the American ideal—a cry that was soon to send Jason Lee and his "argonauts" to the land "where the Oregon rolls . . . and the sunsets go." . .

For days the battle over the bank raged in Congress. Its advocates predicted the ruin of the country if the charter was not granted. Webster (a director) made an eloquent speech declaring that if the charter was not allowed the Constitution would not last fifty years. Benton, as the administration's mouthpiece, held the bank up as a political juggernaut, the creature of perverted corporate powers of the federal Government which, with the practical right of receiving all government funds of deposit and issuing or endorsing all legal-tender money, and of establishing banks in every State free from taxes, served to check the operation of State banks, and favoured individuals in the interest of political cliques. Monroe, like Webster, was on the list of those who had received "loans," as well as Duff Green of the *Telegraph*, whose daughter had married Calhoun's son. Even Jackson had been approached with the offer of a loan, but he declined to be bought. Calhoun championed the bank for

two reasons: he believed a national bank to be a wise measure, and it gave him an issue with Jackson.

The bill was finally passed and went to the President for signature; whereupon Old Hickory, true to his promise to "put the damn rascals out of the bank," promptly vetoed it. In his veto message he made it clear that he was not an antagonist of wealth but only of the principle of monopoly upon which the financial system of the times rested, and of which the bank was the chief illustration. A bank that was useful and convenient was one thing, but the present one was unconstitutional and subversive to the rights of the States. (Jefferson, in opposing the bank of 1791, the creature of Hamilton, had maintained that the "necessary and proper" clause in the Constitution was meant in a restrictive sense to safeguard States' rights.) Consequently, it was practicable to reorganize the bank to combine all its advantages and obviate all its faults. "Every monopoly and all exclusive privileges are granted at the expense of the public. The many millions which this act proposes to bestow on the stockholders of the existing bank must come directly or indirectly from the earnings of the American people. It is due to them, therefore, if their Government sell monopolies and exclusive privileges, that they should at least exact for them as much as their worth in the open market." He went on to show that the value of the monopoly was seventeen million dollars which the Act proposed to sell for *three millions!* "If we must have such a corporation enjoying special favours, why should not the Government sell out the whole stock and secure to the people the full market value of the privileges granted?"

As to the constitutionality of the bank, that ought not to be considered by precedent and by decision of the Supreme Court. "Mere precedent is a dangerous source of authority and should not be regarded as settling questions of constitutional power except where the acquiescence of the people and the States can be considered as well settled." He pointed out

that certain congresses had decided for the bank, others against it; and added, "If the opinion of the Supreme Court covered the whole ground of this Act, it ought not to control the co-ordinate authorities of this Government. Congress, the Chief Executive, and the Court, must *each for itself* be guided by its own opinion of the Constitution. Each public officer who takes oath to support the Constitution swears that he will support it as he understands it, and not as it is understood by others. It is as much the duty of the House of Representatives and the Senate and of the President to decide upon the constitutionality of any bill as it is the supreme judges. . ."

If the Southern nullifiers were angry because Jackson had put a limitation on States' rights by the authority of the federal Government, the National Republicans were furious because he had put a limitation upon the Supreme Court, well knowing how important the tribunal was as an agency to weld together the constitutional framework of the new nation to make it adequate for the coming industrial revolution.

In his shabby, dungeon-like room in the North wing of the Capitol, so constricted that the justices were forced to put on their robes in full view of spectators, the ageing John Marshall must have fancied he heard the rumbling of the very foundations of the Nation which had been his ruling passion since he had first set up the juridical foundations of the Republic in the little basement room under the Capitol when it was a new building in 1801 and began hurling his decisions which, under the guise of scanning the constitutionality of laws and decisions, were actually making a new Constitution and establishing a permanent nation of the Union. "A law repugnant to the Constitution is void," established, in the case of *Marbury vs. Madison*, a new American principle: the right of a federal court to pass on legislation as a self-arrogated power, there being no word in the Constitution of such power, and Madison's proposal in convention that such power be extended to the court having been *four times* rejected. But what the Fathers admitted could not be obtained by

ratification could be obtained by encroachment: in *Fletcher vs. Peck* the State as well as individuals were constrained against passing any laws "impairing the obligations of contracts"; and in the Dartmouth College case (presented by Webster, whose eyes filled with tears and whose voice choked with emotion) this principle was hammered home, thus making possible the immense development of American corporations. And finally when Maryland attempted as a test to tax the new bank, Marshall had, in *McCulloch vs. Maryland*, rendered a decision against the State, establishing the immunity of a federal enterprise against State interference. To strike at the States' power and strengthen the Congress—that was his chief aim.

Had the Constitution been a categoric collection of printed prescriptions as to governmental procedure there might have been some justification for a Supreme Court such as Marshall was manufacturing (in which case the Constitution would have definitely defined it); but the very fact that the Fathers (most of whom were revolutionaries and neither timid nor conservative) had given the Constitution a bold and daring spirit made it necessary for Marshall to recast that instrument in a hard new mould, without flexibility of spirit, to be interpreted by the Judiciary alone. And since the Judiciary was accountable to no one, and could be reversed only by its own action, it constituted not a branch of the Government as the Constitution specified but a form of supergovernment comparable only to the Star Chamber of the Tudors and Stuarts or the French Tribunal in the Reign of Terror, reducing law-making, by its power to veto if not to instigate laws, to a mere academic procedure on the part of the States and of the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and perverting the whole system into a government of nine irresponsible lawyers (the Constitution specified neither the number nine nor lawyers for the Judiciary) rather than a government of laws. Thus the whole new structure of the Supreme Court was an amazing innovation in that it

created an unrepresentative body to pass upon the functioning of a representative government; and an amazing absurdity in that, since the Court's vote might narrow down to one, it put it within the power of one ancient lawyer, no matter how impartial or of what legal acumen he might be, to circumvent the popular will by assuming that he could not be influenced by personal error (to which all fallible men are subject), by blind prejudice (to which many lawyers are addicted), or by bribery (to which most conservatives are unconsciously open because of their disposition to respect an established economic make-up or *status quo*).

Many years before Jefferson had foreseen that a judicial veto would be just as useful for evading the law as for upholding the law, and that a dominant minority controlling the administrative court might use it to obtain their way with the majority. Thus the Government would become a government of lawyers, a class without moral distinctions of right and wrong and whose best members, because of a specialized type of mind, so worshipped law as a fetish that they honestly believed the universe must obey the judicial decree which might thus be easily moulded to meet the prejudices and requirements of a dominant faction. "All know the influence of interest on the mind of man," Jefferson had declared, "and how unconsciously his judgment is warped by that influence. To this bias add that of *ésprit de corps*, of their peculiar maxim and creed that it is the office of a good judge to enlarge his jurisdiction, and how can we expect impartial decision between the central Government, of which they are themselves so *eminent* a part, and an individual State from which they have nothing to hope or fear?" In the end, thought Jefferson, such courts were bound to become political, and "political courts contribute to violence; violence then makes necessary a tribunal that pretends, at any rate, to assure justice, and which men support from an instinct of self-preservation. Always the mechanical principle remains the same."

But John Marshall had never agreed with Jefferson nor

believed in his democracy. For one reason, he lacked the type of imagination to grasp the significance of abstract democracy; for another, he was too close to the common people to have much faith in them. Neither a scholar nor a traditionalist, but a great artist in the law and a politician (in the best sense) of his times, Marshall, like Jackson, was inclined by his vanity to the belief that coherence in expressing the fundamental ideals which underlay the turbulent political currents of the time was a personal attribute. This lack of imagination and belief in himself gave the Chief Justice a deadly advantage, enabling him to create on trivial cases (dealing with office-holders, a minor college, peddlers and lottery-tickets, a steamship monopoly, and the rights of obscure Indian missionaries) a mighty superstructure of federal Government spun out of his own genius which derived its real nourishment from the dual source of popular political currents and the new democratic principle (inaugurated, paradoxically enough, by his enemy Jackson) that greatness could be obtained from office by merely making that *office* great. Yet, as he adopted the cause of Clay and Webster and the bank, Marshall need not have worried about the permanence of the new Nation: his dicta, reflecting rather than originating the Nation's dominant governmental creed following the current trend of legal, political, economic and social thought, were bound to survive. What he did not see was that men might succeed him without his intellect and logic and scrupulous honesty; that his dicta would be so liberalized by times out of joint with his own that neither the Constitution, his own impeccable reasoning, the existing laws, or the previous decisions, would be followed; and that the right of declaring laws unconstitutional, which he had established and exercised so sparingly, would be used in sweeping fashion to protect selfish interests. John Adams's last act as President in installing Marshall as Chief Justice was the most telling trump the Federalists ever played, for it was Marshall who established the *principle of a permanent Nation.*

It would be for future generations to reconcile that principle with democracy—or abandon democracy. . .

THE rumbling of the old foundations in Europe, already infiltrated with the principles of the French Revolution, was again heard in the July days—the "Sunstroke" of 1830—when the fresh-faced and generous Charles X was deposed. A century before Charles might have prospered; but his reactionary rule—he had made the mistake of interdicting the publication of newspapers without license!—aroused the bourgeoisie, already irritated by the reduction of interest rates on government bonds; the working classes, and the intellectuals. But now a division arose between the industrial bourgeoisie and the workingmen, the former demanding a monarchy, the latter a republic. In the end both parties compromised on Louis Philippe, son of "Egalité" Orleans, as "King of the French." "He was at Jamappes. He is a citizen king. He has borne the tricolour standard in the midst of battle; he can bear it again. He will accept the constitution as we wish it to be." So ran Thier's proclamation of the *juste milieu* between Royalty and People. Louis Philippe rode across Paris and appeared on a balcony of the Hotel de Ville with Lafayette whom he publicly embraced as the incarnation of French liberty.

News of the easy victory of the French liberals spread rapidly throughout Europe and aroused anew the spirit of revolt. In Brussels, barricades were thrown up in the streets and independence declared from the hated Dutch. Revolts occurred in northern and central Italy; the Papal States protested against the reactionary rule of Gregory XVI; in Modena and Parma popular uprisings drove out the Hapsburg absolute sovereigns (Metternich rushed Austrian armies to the scene and crushed the movement); the rulers of several German states, acceding to the popular demands, granted constitutions. Austria and Prussia escaped the waves of revolt by a narrow margin. The unfortunate Poles, ground

under the Russian heel, were encouraged by the French to revolt; but when superior numbers of Russians were poured in, France and England left Poland to her fate and that miserable land was incorporated into Russia.

In England the Reform Bill of 1832 (for which old Jeremy Bentham had waited to die that year) was a landmark in the development of representative government, establishing as it did a precedent for reform if not reform itself, breaking the solid front of Tory aristocratic control, and paving the way for Chartism as a means of political expression of the lower classes. Lord John Russell in introducing the bill had made it clear that it was to alleviate the condition of the industrial middle class rather than give the common people rights. Earl Gray, the Whig leader, had used it only as a war-cry against the Tory ministry. Lord Macaulay in advocating parliamentary reform had looked with dismay on universal suffrage as spelling ruin. The reactionary Tories, fearing a repetition of the French Revolution, in turn used the turmoil and violence to defeat the Whig ministry; but even the venerable Duke of Wellington was unable to form a Tory ministry, and William IV had been compelled to promise to create enough liberal lords to pass the bill. Since then the Whigs had begun calling themselves "liberals." England was following her usual course in spasmodically groping for democracy. But where were the equal electoral districts? Where the universal suffrage? If the closed and rotten boroughs were ended and the seats redistributed among inadequately represented areas, that meant the densely populated manufacturing districts. Now, to offset the withholding of white suffrage, the "liberals" were preparing a bill to abolish black slavery in the Empire!

EVERYWHERE men were dying for democracy. But where was liberty to be found? When Spain had revolted against the Sovereign and her colonies set up independent republics, it was *democratic* France who helped restore the tyrant!

When America recognized the South-American republics and warned the powers to keep hands off, it was Tory England that supported her—England which at the same time feared the revolutionary spirit too much to recognize the republics herself! And France, against whose revolutionary doctrines most of the movements and intrigues of the Holy Alliance were directed, had attempted to undermine revolutionary America—and at the same time she joined Russia and England to defeat the Turkish fleet at Navarine and liberate Greece!

Was the banner of democracy being held high that men might not see its bold device, *Empire?* Was that device the one note upon which history played its variations?—from that primitive form when Egyptian kings relinquished the privilege of plundering the Syrians by exacting tribute and agreeing to let the latter alone; to the Roman form when the Eternal City by attempting to create the wealth she took and by improving her tributaries with her own brand of drains and morals wrought her own ruin; to the Barbarians who restored the system of feudal barons with its financial usurers; to the Second Century when the commercialists began to transform themselves into an aristocracy; to a millennium later when England and France took over the role of empire-builders, the former the Roman model, the latter the primitive model; to America where, in Illinois, the Sacs and Foxes, beaten and insulted and reduced to starvation by white squatters greedy for their land, massed under the valiant Black Hawk who had been spurred on by the Potowatomi hotbloods and misled by his soothsayer, White Cloud, to liberate his people. . .

The whole Middle West was aroused to the danger of "a bloody menace and invasion." Four thousand regulars were assigned and several companies of volunteers raised to combat the peril.

It was not a pleasant picture, that of many thousands of well-equipped regulars and militia shooting in drunken glee

at the white-flag bearer of a few hundred desperate and panic-stricken savages, driving them to the bluffs overlooking the Wisconsin River, firing upon a raft of women and children. Finally, when Black Hawk and his few remaining followers reached the Mississippi attempting to escape to the Sioux habitat, the supply-steamer *Warrior* raked the wretched camp with canister, and the Sioux (bribed by the Government) annihilated the survivors and sold Black Hawk to the enemy.

Black Hawk was sent as a prisoner to Fortress Monroe in Virginia in charge of Lieutenant Jefferson Davis who had taken part in the campaign. Abraham Lincoln had raised his own company of volunteers to combat the bloody menace. Both these young Americans were about the same age—twenty-four.

XIV

THERE was no doubt in Calhoun's mind that Jackson would win the forthcoming election, and that when he did so South Carolina would proceed to apply the nullification doctrine. But there was both consistency and adroitness in his refusal to support Jackson's rival: if he had only "repugnance to Jackson," he thoroughly "distrusted Clay," and consistency did not require him to choose one of two evils; and it was timely to make it clear that he was neither a Jacksonian Democrat nor a capitalistic Tory. "I place myself," he wrote, "on the principles that brought the Republican (Democratic) Party into power in 1801. . . Mine are the opinions of the Republican Party of '98 beyond which I do not go an inch." In this role he might yet reach the goal of his ambition: popular democracy was already in its crescent phase and would subside with Jackson; the Southwest, a homogeneous and independent country settled almost exclusively by Southerners, was extending the South westward (already Mississippi and Alabama were identified with the Old South rather than the New West); and with sound views on public lands, the bank, and foreign relations, it was still

possible to secure sufficient following in the North to supplement that in the South and so enable him successfully to ride the wave of conservative reaction (that is, reaction to the revolutionary and republican doctrines of the fathers) when it came. At least, so his Massachusetts friends—Robert Winthrop and Abbot Lawrence—had assured him; and Calhoun was ever willing to believe that "the interests of gentlemen *everywhere* are identical."

That summer New York City fairly bristled with hickory trees planted in Jackson's honour. A public dinner was tendered him in Lexington—Clay's home—and a local newspaper declared that Jefferson, who had penned the Declaration of Independence, and the members of the '76 Congress who had signed it, had "all gone to heaven except Charles Carroll of Carrolton, who only waits as a messenger of peace to carry to the others the news of Andrew Jackson's election." The *Kentuckian*, however, was of another opinion. "The President is a dotard, a driveler, a superannuated, miserably doting old man." The Boston *Courier* declared: "The people have chosen Andrew Jackson. Yet there is comfort left. God has promised that the days of the wicked shall be short. The wicked is old and feeble, and he may die before he is elected. It is the duty of every good Christian to pray for our Maker to have pity on us." Puritanism, apparently, was far from dead.

Jackson had mentioned the constitutionality of the bank only as a matter of form, meaning to settle the question by the sheer force of the vote; and he issued an appeal to the South and West for support, declaring that his action had been directed against a purely sectional—and he might have added private—institution that was abetting monopoly and constantly *sending money to England*. The bank at its own expense printed thirty thousand copies of this document, and President Biddle declared: "Jackson is like a chained panther, biting the bars of his cage." Clay and Webster publicly referred to him as an old dotard at the end of his career.

Whether the Puritans did not pray hard enough, or whether God was moving in a mysterious way to answer their prayers through the medium of Old Hickory himself (as seemed more likely to Calhoun), Jackson was re-elected by two hundred and nineteen electoral votes against Clay's forty-nine and the largest popular vote of any President in history. This was the mandate he had been waiting for to continue his policy towards the nullifiers and the bank. Until autumn he vacationed at Old Point Comfort, returning to Washington for his second inauguration. The ceremony was marked by the greatest simplicity: the President rode to the Capitol building and walked back to the White House; there was no procession, no military escort, and little demonstration. He attended the ball at the Central Masonic Hall; but the affair was popular rather than fashionable, and Washington society put in a brief appearance or none at all. . .

WASHINGTON was now a rambling and characterless town of fifteen or twenty thousand, its streets unpaved, its one first-class hotel, Gadsby's, overrun with congressmen and their families, its better residences new and pretentious with their gas lights, modern knockers, stoves and rocking chairs, and their primitive sewage. Like the Government it housed, the city was in a state of flux, just taking form. The Capitol building had been completed by the addition of the centre portion between the old wings with a cast-iron dome imposed, all in the free classical manner adopted by Charles Bullfinch. At the same time the Treasury Building was being finished in the large, wide and severe manner of the Great Revolution. The White House, begun in the year of Washington's inauguration, had been copied from an Irish country seat which in turn had derived from the Italian Renaissance style, and was an imposing residence even with its withered grass plot in front protected by a wooden fence. The early American culture which had given to architecture its older and gentler classic tradition was weakening, and the new feeling was for

new forms as opposed to imitation. However, the early builders had copied European culture—not its civilization. In repudiating this, the new generation had exactly reversed the process, refusing European culture and copying its civilization.

The White House levees (which Jefferson had so disliked) were held on Tuesdays and Fridays from two to four. Once only gentlemen of higher importance, and never ladies, were expected to attend these gatherings; and the President, resplendent in purple or black silk, one hand on his cocked hat and the other on his sword, would bow gravely as each guest was presented and later join the various groups for polite conversation and a glass of wine. But now the event was become a gathering of all sorts and conditions of men and women—suave, handsome Daniel Webster (whose good cheer was sometimes suspected of having come from a bottle); that "lion-hearted knight" Harry Clay, paying elegant compliments to the ladies (with a definite purpose, according to scandal-mongers) in a siren-like voice; bald-headed, gaunt-faced, rotund John Quincy Adams, unctuous and sleepy and ill-tempered by turns; the "little magician" or "polite fox" Martin Van Buren, listening to everything and committing himself about nothing; the forty-year-old Sam Houston, in full Cherokee garb whenever the fancy struck him; editor Frank Blair of the *Globe*, whom Jackson had imported from Kentucky two years before; "Silky Milky" Samuel Harrison Smith, first editor of the *National Intelligencer*, or the "National Smoothing-Plane" as the Whig-Republicans termed it; the affable Thomas Hart Benton of Missouri; the sternly literary Harriet Martineau, with comb and brush, probably, in her ample pocket; the insurgent English actress Fanny Kemble, paragon of dramatic art, violent Abolitionist, and critic of everything American; the picturesque Anne Royal, Washington's "Meg Merrilies" or common scold, whose *Paul Pry*, defending Masonry and the Constitution and attacking Evangelism, had once brought her

near a ducking in the Potomac, and who had lunched with the President on a cooked partridge she fetched in her pocket; and so on through the list – and this President wore dingy black, sometimes smoked a long reed pipe with a red clay bowl, and shook hands with all the guests and entered into animated personal and political discussions with them. And yet, despite his unkempt coarse grey hair and careless dress, and his impulsive, even violent, manners, General Jackson somehow gave the impression of stateliness – somewhat the combined dignity of a monarch, a patriarch, and an Indian Chief.

The conversation was free and unrestrained. Would Jackson whip South Carolina, or had that State already won a subtle victory? Had Sam Houston been justified in publicly thrashing the Ohio congressman for intimating that the Indian-supply contracts the former was seeking were frauds? Had Lafayette, or even Louis Philippe himself, suggested that now was a good time to demand that France pay her war debts, so that Jackson's threats to seize French possessions was a mere bluff? Had anyone seen the *American*, the new Baltimore & Ohio engine, with its power equal to sixteen horses, its noiseless movements, its retrograde motion, and its amazing speed of forty miles an hour?

Slavery was always a lively topic. Was there any significance in Garrison's New England Anti-Slavery Society having become the *American* Anti-Slavery Society? Young Salmon P. Chase had announced himself as the "attorney-general for runaway slaves" at Cincinnati; Whittier was publishing his Abolitionist verse; Charles Sumner had just arrived at Washington to study law; Garrison was in England trying to persuade the reformer Thompson to come to America. What was behind the English emancipation movement? The English did not usually support a philanthropy unless it was combined with power. Was Mr. Calhoun right in affirming that the failure of Great Britain to increase tropical productions in the West Indies had led her to fix an eye on India

and Africa, and slavery being no longer profitable, and the South her only competitor in this production, she wished to destroy the latter's capacity?

Discussion of slavery led to other reforms: the abortive attempt of Fanny Wright and Robert Owen at Memphis to buy up slaves, free the South, and abolish marriage and the Bible; a new Temperance Society forming to the north to keep people from having their toddy; the Methodist "travelling secretaries" to save the country from such firebrands of hell as slavery, alcohol and Catholicism. Well, such were the fruits of Puritanism and Quakerism that had borrowed the monotheism of the Jews for its practical value in levelling all pagan, saintly and social hierarchies (whose virtues were those of masters, and whose sins were the failings of slaves) in order to substitute sentimentalism and optimism for *Pagan* realism and pessimism. . .

On days when there was no levee, Washington society paid calls from twelve to four (except on Sunday when the city was given over to the Negroes), or went to the races—a colourful affair, with its hundreds of visitors, the gentlemen on horseback unless they were escorting their ladies in carriages, and the poorer people in carts, and with its numerous booths and tables. Dinner was generally served at six, and guests arrived a quarter before the hour and stayed until coffee at seven. Formal dinners, with their quota of antiquated belles and discredited statesmen, were for the most part dreary. The decorations were invariably the same: artificial flowers or a mirror-lake with statuettes of mythological subjects. Soup, fish and roasts, with side-dishes of teal and ham, were served, and only green vegetables, potatoes and beets being considered vulgar. Ices and custards served as sweets, old-fashioned pies and puddings also being considered *démodé*.

More elegant and gayer affairs were the drawing-rooms, held from seven to nine in the evening. Masculine attire had

sobered from its earlier debauch of powdered hair gathered in black silk bags behind the neck, silk short-clothes, diamond knee-buckles and brightly japanned shoes surmounted with square silver buckles, hats decorated with American cockades, and light slender dress-swords in green shagreen scabbards with richly ornamented hilts; but the women's costumes were more gorgeous, with low-cut and tight-fitting bodices of satins and brocades trimmed with berthas of point lace, their hair, dressed with flowers and feathers, in a love-knot behind or tight curls on the shoulders as portrayed in the fashionable *Godey's Lady Book.*

The former "Lady Presidentess," Dolly Madison, gorgeous in coloured velvet Spencer, her neck and arms hung with jewels, her head surmounted with a Parisian turban of velour gauze from which waved bird-of-paradise plumes, dominated her "withered little apple-john," as Washington Irving designated Madison. Mrs. John Quincy Adams still affected the leg-of-mutton sleeve and gigantic poke bonnet. Mrs. William Winston Seaton, wife of the *National Intelligencer's* editor, complained she did not like Washington so much as her home, Raleigh, North Carolina, because "the women rouge too much, and they do not have hot bread for breakfast, and they serve tea at nine with bread and no sweet cakes." Over the tables where they played loo for amazingly high stakes, the matrons discussed the daring new waltz from Vienna which the débutantes were dancing; the propriety of lionizing Black Hawk, who was being exhibited in the larger cities as an object lesson, in polite society; the Kembles' play, *The Stranger,* which the Quakers in Philadelphia thought abominable because it portrayed a noble-hearted husband taking back to his bosom an *erring* wife; a new fragment, *The Coliseum,* from Shelley's pen; Mrs. Trollope's new novel, *The Refuge of America,* extracts from which were appearing currently in the *London Athenæum,* and which grossly misrepresented the American dialect; and so on. The gentlemen gossipped about the merits of the *Sporting Magazine* and

the hunting of wild bull in the Washitaw Forest west of the Mississippi; a recent brush between Mountain Trappers and Black Feet Indians; the expected crash of Biela's Comet, discovered four years before, which scientists feared might strike the earth; current *rencontres* on the field of honour; the amazing sermon of John Keble at Oxford on *National Apostasy* urging his fellow-churchmen in England (and that, of course, included American Episcopalians) to return to Catholicism, the faith of their fathers. Among those who were generally to be seen at the drawing-rooms were Albert Gallatin, who had been Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury and one of the negotiators of the Ghent Treaty; Francis Scott Key of Baltimore, who wrote "The Star-Spangled Banner" which was becoming popular as a patriotic song to the tune of "To Anacreon in Heaven" (which had also been used as a setting for Tom Paine's "Adams and Liberty"); Colonel John Mayo, who built the bridge over the James River; his elegant son-in-law General Winfield Scott, hero of Lundy's Lane; the eighty-year-old John Marshall, being whimsical about his profession; Calhoun, who was *de trop* at the levees, and John Randolph of Roanoke, who had been refused admission to the White House because Jackson fancied him responsible for a critical newspaper article.

The eccentric Randolph, whose claim to be dying from tuberculosis no one took seriously, generally monopolized the conversation wherever he happened to be present. Since his return from Russia two years before Randolph had not re-entered public life, and it was rumoured he was becoming insane; but in his rambling, disconnected monologues, delivered in a high squeaky voice, his long bony fingers toying with his heavy upper lip or with his straight coarse hair that had once been coal-black (a heritage from his ancestress, the Indian Princess Pocahontas), there were frequent flashes of a keen insight.

"What are Virginia gentlemen?" he demanded. "We hug our lousy cloaks about us, take another chaw tobacco, ruin

the grate and firearms (where they do not happen to be already rusty), and try out our conclusions on constitutional points. . . Our country is irretrievably ruined if we do not get rid of that wretched old man (Jackson). I leave to old Djezzar Pasha, the Hartford men, and the ultra-Federalists and office-holders and office-seekers their triumph over the liberties of the country. They will stand condemned to everlasting infamy. . . The mercenary troops" – standing armies were always that to him – "that disembark at Charleston are merely working in their vocation, poor devils; the responsibility rests on the President. I am resolved personally not to assist in the subjugation of South Carolina, but if she does move, to make common cause against the usurpations of the federal Government and of the Supreme Court especially. . . The infamous decisions of those minions of arbitrary power will give us Georgia. Everything south of Ohio, except perhaps Kentucky and the western district of Virginia, must be with us. With this noble country and Cuba, where we can make a hogshead of sugar as easily as a pound in Mississippi or in Florida, we shall have a vast empire capable of indefinite improvement and supporting easily forty million people."

The population of the United States then numbered thirteen million. Michigan was preparing to enter the Union; other western States would be carved out of the other territory. The American Empire was a reality; a Southern Empire only a dream. Without bothering to explain why he feared the one and favoured the other, Randolph proceeded: "No government extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific can exist because it must want the common feeling with the governed that is indispensable to its existence. There is death in the potion, compound it how you will. . . So I thought when I saw General Washington take the oath. I could not hear him, but I saw that Washington did not see, but two other Virginians – George Mason and Patrick Henry – saw: the poison under its wing!"

On the subject of Van Buren's recall from England, Con-

gress having refused to confirm his appointment to that mission by Jackson, Randolph was eloquent. "I told the President that Van Buren was too great an intriguer, and besides was wanting in dignity. He is an adroit, managing little man who cannot inspire respect, much less veneration. He cannot even speak the English language correctly, and I can see the eyebrows of the fashionable world in London raised at his pronunciation. Except perhaps for Albert Gallatin, I do not know anyone besides myself fit for the post. . . Livingston is an excellent choice for France, mostly because of his wife. In Paris a minister's wife is as important as he is: there Mrs. Livingston would dazzle and charm."

Reverting to England, Randolph was sure that there was no society in the world with the easy and agreeable manners of the English upper class. That was why only gentlemen should be sent to the Court of St. James: those clever colonial experts knew how to pervert by flattery the representatives of a democratic nation, so that unless an American's roots were firmly fixed in his native culture, he tended to become more English than the English. Randolph had himself refused to conform to English etiquette, and as an individual had insisted upon all the prerogatives of their aristocracy. Ten years before when he was in London (at the time of the coronation of that "English Vitellius," George IV), Lord Limerick had introduced him to the doorkeeper of the House of Lords so that he might be admitted without order. The great debate was the Roman Catholic Peers' Bill. (Ridiculous, debating whether a man's religion qualified him for rights!) "In the gallery I met Thomas Moore, the spruce and dapper Bard of Erin. I asked him why he had lampooned my cousin Thomas Jefferson, and he answered it was because the latter had snubbed him on his visit to Washington. He asked me if I had read his *Crib's Memorandum to Congress,* and I told him I'd read everything he had written and that his best effort was *Twopenny-Postbag,* which was real fun; but that his *Rhymes of the Road* was a dreary effort of a drawing-room

poet to capture the poetry of nature – possibly an attempt to imitate his friend Shelley who died that year." There were other visitors to the gallery whom Randolph met that day: Robert Southey, Elizabeth Fry, Maria Edgeworth, and even England's premier actor, Edmond Kean, the great Crookback Richard. "I admired very much the manners and wit of Lord Castlereagh, but I predicted then that he would come to no good end. An Irish Tory, sir, is ridiculous – like an American monarchist. He had sold his independence and that of his country, and I was not surprised to hear of his suicide."

In Randolph's estimate of the great Irish minister of Great Britain was the gist of what appeared to most people as a paradoxical attitude, in that he extolled French and American democratic institutions (signing letters to the President as "Your fellow-citizen," calling his plantation *Bizarre*, and naming his slaves and horses Mirabeau, Jacobin, Danton, and Radical), at the same time he scorned English absolutism and English democracy alike; admired the pleasant and ordered English social life, while ridiculing its American sycophants; lauded religious freedom in America at the same time he repudiated the democratic American Episcopal Church and upheld the established *Ecclesia Anglicana* (in which he still claimed membership under the Diocesan of London).

But Randolph's attitude was not so much an affectation of paradox as it was a rebuke of affectation in others. Americans who lauded the glories of centralized or monarchical powers and yet went on taking advantage of their *democratic freedom* to undermine the established constitutional Government without any material risk, were on a par with English "liberals" who wrote idylls on revolution and democracy and primitivism and continued to live like Tories – while Tories lived only to make game laws and poor laws and legislate against Catholics and dissenters, and (for the privilege of ruling) made demoralizing concessions to the industrialists; and neither would get very far so long as they tried to recon-

cile their beliefs with the *existing* form of government, instead of sacrificing their material comforts in an attempt to change the government to accord with their ideals. In established democracies such as America and (on occasion) France, patriotism was a simple emotion apart from loyalty to government which, to command respect, must deal justly with its constituency and constantly improve; while in feudalist England, the loyalty of a Peel or a Wellington to the Throne was tantamount to patriotism. In Randolph's case, Virginia was his *patrie* and the object of his patriotism independent of any loyalty to the central Government – as Ireland should have been of Castlereagh. As for religion, his dislike of the absolute State was enhanced by its mission to reduce the Church to anarchy and thus deprive men of a rock on which to build their moral life; and though, like all imaginative men, he had a fondness for sowing the wild oats of metaphysics and theology, he scorned the transparently coherent theology of William Paley that reduced God to a remote artificer Who, after constructing the world, refrained from further interference in it; and had a supreme contempt for Puritanism both as a creed commanding regeneration in spontaneous consciousness of being able to use the will in accordance with the Will of God, or as the moralism of this grim faith that still remained in the Yankee character and literature. . .

A marked contrast with Randolph was his lifelong friend John Marshall: the one witty, elegant, arrogant, living in feudal splendour at his plantation with its hundreds of slaves, delighting in theorizing away all standardized conduct; the other, plain of speech, plainer of dress, living simply at his Richmond home (for which he did his own marketing), following conduct doggedly with a prosaic conscience. By all appearances Randolph should have been the Tory, Marshall the Democrat; but instead, it was Randolph who believed implicitly in the common people, Marshall who implicitly distrusted them. It was Randolph who, though owning hun-

dreds of slaves, turned his efforts about this time to effect emancipation in Virginia; Marshall, who bitterly fought the measure, and bought his one "likely man" with smug conscientiousness. . .

LATER in the year Randolph went to the Senate where Clay was speaking. "I want to hear that voice again," he said. When he had finished Clay came down and spoke to his old friend from whom he had been estranged since their duel. "I hope you are better, sir," he said gently. "No, sir, I am a dying man; I am on my way now to Philadelphia to consult a doctor. But I came here expressly to see you," answered Randolph. They shook hands and parted—the incarnations of the old South and of the new North-West.

Randolph died in Philadelphia. He freed by manumission all his slaves, and used his wealth to provide for their colonization in western territory.

XV

SOON after election, the South Carolina Convention met and declared the tariff acts of 1828 and 1832 null and void, and prohibited payment of duties under those laws after February 1, 1833, *unless the federal Government gave some relief;* declaring that if no relief were accorded and the national authority should be enforced within the boundaries of the State, war would immediately ensue. Governor James Hamilton and the Legislature, which might be called into extra session at any time, were authorized to call out the militia, purchase arms, and organize for the conflict.

The specific act of the South Carolina Convention was consistent, logical and courageous; but that it went beyond the nullification movements in other States in putting into practice what the others had merely advanced as a political opinion (employing only such force as opinion exerts), was quite another thing. The Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions had

followed the spirit of the Declaration of Independence which, declaring that "whenever any form of government becomes destructive to . . . liberty and the pursuit of happiness it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it," was largely an idea based on the "social contract" theory of Rousseau, Locke and others, that all governments were nothing more than social compacts with implied limitations; and applying that idea to the peculiar form of the federal Government, it followed that the Constitution was not merely an implied but an express contract between the States, so that each State had to determine for itself, as a principal, when the contract had been broken. In spirit, therefore, the South Carolina resolutions were just; but as for the validity of precedent, that would hardly be more weighty than the partisan counter-resolutions of several times as many State legislatures denouncing them. More significant was the manner in which suggestions of secession had been received in the two great sections. The Federalist Party of New England, whose attempt to impose laws inconsistent with American ideas of personal liberty and freedom of speech or the press and to vest the President with arbitrary and despotic powers had provoked the Virginia and Kentucky Resolutions, was discredited even in New England, though the Northern States at the same time had unanimously condemned the Resolutions. And when the same party through the Hartford Convention had sounded the note of secession, such a taint of treason clung to it as to make it odious and the delegates to the Convention political outcasts. When the Legislature of Pennsylvania in 1809 had passed resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution for the establishment of an impartial tribunal "to determine disputes between the general and State Governments," not one State—even in the South—agreed. The conclusion was that in general the States' rights doctrine was regarded as a private or party opinion in the North; in the South it was more universally accepted by the masses and sustained as an unwritten part of party platforms. In the

South, therefore, a greater loyalty to the State than to the central Government was not considered treason, she being nearer in spirit to colonial democracy than the more "progressive" North; though by the same reasoning Massachusetts' action twenty-five years later in annulling (and actually putting the nullification into practice) the Fugitive Slave Law would have to stand as self-convicted treason. . .

THE results of the election assured Jackson of two things: that the country was not behind Clay's tariff program (the latter's "American System" had culled him only one-sixth of the votes, or forty-nine out of two hundred and eighty-eight); and that the South would not support South Carolina in her stand. In his message, therefore, Old Hickory indicated that the tariff must be reduced to a revenue basis; and before the end of the year Verplanck of New York was reporting a bill in the House designed to do away with most of the abuses, going far in the direction of South Carolina's demands. At the same time Jackson did not propose to let South Carolina – of which he took pride in calling himself a "citizen by birth" – go unrebuked. On December 9 he wrote Joel Poinsett, a Unionist of Charleston, "The vain threats of resistance by those who have raised the standard of rebellion show their madness and folly. You may assure those patriots who cling to their country and this Union which most secures *liberty and prosperity and happiness*, that within forty days I can have within the limits of South Carolina fifty thousand men, and in forty days more another fifty thousand. How impotent their threat of resistance with a population of only two hundred and fifty thousand whites and nearly that double in blacks, with our ships in port to aid in the execution of our laws! The wickedness, madness and folly of the leaders and the delusion of their followers in their attempt to destroy themselves and our Union has not its parallel in the history of the world. The Union will be preserved." Having delivered this threat – which showed

his nervousness about the situation – Jackson issued his proclamation, in answer to the South Carolina Nullification Convention, the next day. The proclamation, a masterpiece of clarity and logic, was written by the able Secretary of State Livingston; but even as such it was only convincing to those who assumed the premise. The provincial concerts and State sentiments of the "unsafe guides" were contrasted with the national services and ideals of the South Carolina patriots of the Revolution (without stating, however, that South Carolina was now contending for practically the same principles!), and gave notice that nullified laws must be obeyed. "Those who told you that you might peaceably prevent their execution deceived you: they could not have deceived themselves. . . Their object is disunion, but be not deceived by names: disunion by armed force is treason." A month later – on January 16 – Jackson asked Congress to authorize him to change or abolish certain ports of entry in South Carolina and to use the land and naval forces to execute the customs laws, a request which was five days later granted in the Revenue Collection Bill, the "Force Bill," or the "bloody bill" as the nullifiers called it. Jackson wrote Nathaniel Macon that he intended to "coerce South Carolina in the name of the Sage of Monticello."

Probably Old Hickory realized that unless there was a force bill to emphasize the grave danger of the situation, and also to satisfy the belligerency of the tariff men, the new tariff bill, with its implied capitulation to South Carolina, would never pass. But an even stronger influence with him was his sense of outraged authority and his hatred of Calhoun. He dispatched Farragut, commanding the *Natchez*, and Scott, commanding the land forces – both Southerners – to Charleston, declaring: "If a single drop of blood is shed in defiance of the laws of the United States I will hang the first man I lay hands on engaged in such treasonable conduct upon the first tree I can reach." Everyone expected Calhoun, for whom this threat was meant, to be arrested upon his arrival

in Washington; for though Jackson might coerce others to keep the law, he had no happy disposition for doing so himself. Webster, too, was made happy by the "Force Bill." As the accepted intellectual exponent of the new constitutional nationalism he was delighted to see his doctrines upheld by so vigorous an execution of the laws. "I think the people of the United States demand of us who are intrusted with the Government . . . to sustain the Union and the Constitution against whatsoever may endanger them. For one, I obey this public voice; I comply with the demands of the people." Since the only people Webster was interested in were raising their voices to demand protection, he welcomed the nullification agitation as being the least likely thing, because of its unpopular features, to disturb protection. In the present issue, however, he had no recourse but to take sides, and for him the only side was Jackson's, first, because he was straining to show consistency in his former arguments with Hayne, and second, that with Jackson (who, despite his bluster about the hundreds of applications he had in his desk from those wishing to join the troops sent against South Carolina, was gravely alarmed) he might constitute himself the guardian of the Union and so edge out Clay, who had not consulted him as to terms of settlement.

But even Webster did not realize the extent to which the industrialist party was disturbed. The secession of the South was the last thing they wanted, since it would cut their market in half. But on the other hand, Jackson's double victory (the simultaneous settlement of the tariff and nullification problems) would hurt their political prestige. And while they did not object seriously to lowering the tariff (the Southern market meant more to them than higher duties), that would be a triumph for Calhoun, who was now the incarnation of all anti-tariff policies. Better a lower tariff than none at all; but they wanted the credit for lowering it. So Clay, who besides seeing that his "American System" was in jeopardy really feared that civil war was imminent, stopped

off at Philadelphia for a conference with industrial leaders who agreed to work out a plan for reducing the tariff themselves. Clay knew that this meant he must cultivate Calhoun for the time being; but Clay never permitted sensibilities to interfere with his plans. . .

On January 4, 1833, Calhoun arrived in Washington to enter the Senate, the field of his greatest labours, having resigned as Vice President in July to take the seat vacated by General Hayne who had resigned to become Governor. Undoubtedly he had assurances that his State would suspend the ordinances of nullification, scheduled to go into effect February 1, pending congressional action on the tariff, so as to avoid a collision and to facilitate a satisfactory adjustment. Both Virginia and Alabama had advised suspension on the assurance that a milder tariff would be imposed; and Virginia had offered to act in the extraordinary role of intermediary between a State and the federal Government.

It was a dramatic occasion when Calhoun took his seat. Anxiety for the Union had made the thronged galleries tense with anticipation. The night before, a friend had gone to Calhoun's mess to warn him that he would be arrested, and on his way to the Capitol great crowds collected to see him. It was obvious that, for so mild-mannered a man, he was feverishly excited. What they did not know was that the state of his health, never robust, was such from the terrible strain that he was really ill; physical, as well as political, ruin stared him in the face.

But those who came to see fireworks were disappointed. For ten days Calhoun made no strategic move, until the day after the "Force Bill" was reported when he introduced three resolutions asserting that the Constitution was a compact; that certain definite powers were delegated to the general Government; and that there was *no nation* without sovereignty, all of which and the allegiance of their respective citizens the States had retained so that each State had a right

to judge both as to the powers delegated and those reserved. Thus the "Force Bill" must "tend directly and inevitably to subvert the sovereignty of the States, to destroy the federal character of the Union, and to rear on its ruins a consolidated Government, without constitutional check or limitation, and which must necessarily terminate in the loss of liberty itself." His motive was to outlaw the "Force Bill" before it came up; but the Senate decided otherwise and Calhoun's resolutions had to wait, though he was assured that a copy of the President's proclamation and the papers received from South Carolina would be included in the bill when it came up for debate. Thus Calhoun served notice in advance that he intended to attack the bill, and it was generally thought that Webster would answer him in behalf of Jackson. The latter's carriage was frequently seen in front of Webster's house these days.

On February 12 Clay presented his tariff bill. The repeal of the Edict of Nantes, he declared, would be nothing in comparison with the sudden abolition of the tariff; therefore he wished to save protection by bringing in a compromise. A slow reduction with a substantial remnant of protection would prevent a serious shock. He expressed the opinion that the passage of his bill would suffice to restore the obedience of South Carolina without the "Force Bill." When Calhoun announced on the floor that he would support Clay's compromise there was tumultuous applause in the galleries.

"What think you?" Judge Storey wrote a Philadelphia friend. "What think you of the somerset here? The great Champion of the American System has united with Mr. Calhoun! The protective system and the constitutional power to protect it are to be abandoned! Instead of the sudden destruction of life at a single blow, the patient is to be slowly bled to death. We have all been in amazement."

Clay made light of his stand in his usual facetious manner. "I looked at Calhoun and the other South Carolinians, so haggard and drawn, and I thought, they are clever fellows

and it would never do to let old Jackson hang them." But when someone twitted him with the charge that Calhoun was now his master, he shouted angrily: "Sir, I would not own him as my slave." Benton, however, could look beneath the exterior and see . . . two men sincerely desirous of compromise, both having learned, each in his own way – the one through opposing it, the other through defending it – that the tariff, no matter how regarded, was a real obstacle to the advancement of the Union.

The way was now cleared for the debate on Calhoun's resolutions. . .

BOTH Calhoun and Webster held back, each waiting for the other to speak in order that he might close the debate. Finally, forced to begin the debate, Calhoun was non-committal and rambling. "Mr. Calhoun spoke today," wrote Webster. "As a constitutional argument it is too inconsiderable for an answer. There is nothing to it. Mr. Calhoun may say, 'Non sum qualis eram.' I do not wish to speak but it seems unavoidable. Courage. I cannot better the matter of 1830 nor equal it, but I will try not to show evidence of senility." Both he and Jackson thought Calhoun was too agitated to speak coherently, which was what Calhoun wanted them to think. Webster unwarily fell into the trap, and his answering speech was indifferent.

The real debate was now on. Calhoun's great speech and Webster's great answer were both delivered the same day – February 26. Calhoun apologized for his speech in advance, explaining that he had not spoken to a general assembly in sixteen years: then, his back against the rail separating the Senate from the lobby, having pushed away all the chairs from the long desk in front, he spoke to the hushed chamber and gallery while walking rapidly from side to side. Taking his three resolutions as a text, he made an eloquent appeal for States' rights and colonial democracy, consolidating his facts and marshalling his generalizations with such irresistible logic

and force as to make his hearers forget whether or not they had agreed with the premise. Employing none of Jackson's personalities, none of Clay's whimsies, and none of Webster's sarcasms, he paid his hearers—as always—the courtesy of extreme seriousness in a matter upon which they felt as intensely as he.

"I object," said Webster in substance, "to the use of the phrase *constitutional compact*. Constitution is a noun-substantive, not an adjective."

"Very well; but I was only repeating the Senator's own words." Calhoun pointed out the phrase in Webster's speech.

"The States agreed that each should participate in the sovereignty of the other," said Webster.

Calhoun: How could the States make an agreement except by a constitution? And how could they agree but by compact?

Webster: The language of the Constitution is irreconcilable with the idea of a compact . . . it is the language of a superior to an inferior, and is, therefore, not the language of a compact.

Calhoun: If the Senator will turn to the Articles of Confederation (which he acknowledges *is* a compact) he will find that those very prohibitory articles of the Constitution were borrowed from that instrument; that the language which he now considers as implying superiority was taken verbatim from it. And if he should extend his researches still further, he will find that it is the habitual language used in treaties.

Webster: Sovereignty resides in the federal Government.

Calhoun: It is a question of what the federal Government *is*. If it is a federal Union, then the sovereignty of any federal union resides in the parts and not in the whole. . . The States of America are units, the Union is a multiple: not, as the Senator claims, the Union is a unit and the States fractions.

Webster: The very fact that a State may be sued is evidence of want of sovereignty.

Calhoun: This is indeed a surprise. We have on the

statute-book a standing law by which the United States Government may be sued in certain land cases. If the provision of the Constitution on this point proves anything, it proves the very reverse of what the Senator contends.

Webster's last speech was short, almost abrupt, concluding with a plea for the growing popular conception of the Union. "Turn this question over, present it as we will, argue upon it as we may, exhaust upon it all the fountains of metaphysics, stretch over it all the meshes of logical and political subtlety, it still comes to this: Shall we have a general Government? Shall we continue the Union of the States under a government instead of a league? This is the upshot of the whole matter. Because, if we are to have a government, that government must act like other governments, by majorities; it must have this power, like other governments, of enforcing its own laws and its own decisions; clothed with authority by the people and always responsible to the people; it must be able to hold on its course unchecked by external interposition. According to this gentleman's view of the matter, the Constitution is a league; according to mine, it is a regular popular government. This vital and all-important question *the people will decide*, and, in deciding it, they will determine whether by ratifying the present Constitution and *frame of government* they meant to do nothing more than to amend the articles of the old confederation."

Who was the winner? No doubt each debater successfully maintained his premise and refuted his opponent. Webster had admitted that if the Constitution was a compact then Calhoun was right; but he denied that such was the case. James Madison, who, though past eighty, still thought lucidly in terms of a memory extending back to colonial days, wrote Webster in acknowledgment of his speech: "It is fortunate when disputed theories can be decided by undisputed facts. And here the undisputed fact is, that the Constitution was made by the people, but as embodied into the several States, who were parties to it and therefore made by the

States in their highest authoritative capacity. They might, by the same authority and by the same process have converted the Confederacy into a mere league or treaty; or continued it with enlarged or abridged powers; have embodied the people of their respective States into one people, nation or sovereignty; or, as they did by a mixed form make them one people, nation, or sovereignty, *for certain purposes and not so for others.*" Adams expressed somewhat the same opinion in his usual blunt way: "The federal Government is both . . . a government of the people and a compact between the States. Webster is a very handsome speaker, but he overlooked a point as plain as day, and he hung his cause upon a broken hinge in maintaining the government not to be a compact."

He would be the winner, therefore, to whomever accepted his *ex parte* claims—Webster's of nationalism, Calhoun's of States' rights. Jackson declared (characteristically enough, even before the principal speeches were delivered!) that he understood Webster had utterly demolished Calhoun, "handled him like a child." John Randolph, who had listened to the debate from the gallery, declared, "Webster is dead! I saw him dying an hour ago!" Whatever might be the partisan opinion, however, it remained a fact that Calhoun had single-handedly upheld his point against overwhelming odds. His long career in the Senate had begun as dramatically as it was to end.

In the meantime, on February 20, the "Force Bill" had been passed by the Senate as a precursor to the passage of Clay's tariff bill. When Grundy of Tennessee spoke of it as a measure of peace Calhoun had exclaimed: "Yes, such peace as the wolf gives to the lamb—the kite to the dove! Such peace as Russia gives to Poland, or death to its victim! A peace by extinguishing the political existence of the State, by awing her into an abandonment of the exercise of every power which constitutes her a sovereign community. It is to South Carolina a question of self-preservation; and I proclaim

it that should this bill pass, and an attempt be made to enforce it, it will be resisted at every hazard – even that of death itself. Death is not the greatest calamity: there are others still more terrible to the free and the brave, among which may be placed the loss of liberty and honour." All the Southern members except John Tyler disdained to oppose it by vote, so that by their withdrawal the measure was passed 32 to 1. Just after the House passed the bill, McDuffie rose "to perform a solemn duty." The House was about to destroy the rights of the States – was about to bury the Constitution. He would write the epitaph in the title of the bill: "An act to subvert the sovereignty of the States of this Union, to establish a consolidated Government without limitation of powers, and to make the civil subordinate to the military."

On March 2 the President signed both bills, the tariff and the force bills; and thus "the olive branch and the rod were bound up together." . .

THE following day Congress adjourned, and Calhoun immediately started South. The Nullification Convention had been called for March 11, and it would be necessary to travel night and day if he was to reach Columbia by that time.

Ordinarily he travelled by packet to Norfolk; but it had been an unusually severe winter and the Potomac was still frozen over. Dickens on a similar trip complained of the packet service which required all the passengers of one sex to sleep in the same cabin, some on chairs, some on the floor, and a favoured few in the curtainless bunks, while the next morning all were expected to use the same brush for their hair; but Calhoun thanked heaven for the boon, and hoped that the service would ultimately be extended so that he could make the entire journey to Charleston that way. Only a few miles of railway had been laid in America since the Manchester & Liverpool experiment some years before, but there was a stage as far as Alexandria – a vehicle (still according to Dickens) made like the French, and hung, in lieu of

springs, on leather bands, and driven by wild Negroes over muddy roads in such a way as to put the traveller's very life in jeopardy! — and to Calhoun, shivering in his otter-skin greatcoat presented to him by an Indian chief, the stage was a luxury compared to the manner in which he must make the rest and greater part of the trip, in open mail carts over roads broken by frost and unfit for coaches.

When Calhoun reached Columbia he found the State Convention already in session, its members in an ugly temper and ready to discuss the question of secession. It was humiliating to know that nullification had failed as a popular movement in the South, even though it had served to hasten the fall of the high tariff. The "Force Bill" was, of course, the most insulting feature of the compromise, and the Convention soothed this wound by nullifying *that* bill (though McDuffie inquired how it proposed to nullify the Army and Navy of the United States). But Calhoun's haggard looks and pleas for patience, added to the appeals of the Virginia commissioner, B. W. Leigh, in the end prevailed, and the ordinance of nullification was repealed.

Thus was clumsily mended for the time being the widening breach in the Union, though nothing could repeal the opening of men's eyes to the possibility of secession. The "Force Bill" had provoked the Legislature into resolving that each State had a right "for the preservation of its liberties or vital interests to secede peaceably from the Union"; that the primary and paramount allegiance of the citizens of South Carolina "is of right due to this State"; and that the State would "repel force by force, and relying upon the blessings of God will maintain its liberty at all hazards." Robert Barnwell Rhett challenged the members of the Convention to "lay their hands on their hearts and say that they were ardently attached to the Union. Why, had they not for the past seven years been declaiming against the Union as inflicting upon them oppression and poverty and desolation? If a confederacy of the Southern States could now be obtained, should

they not deem it a happy termination – happy beyond expectation! – of their long struggle for their rights against oppression?" From a Southern point of view surely it was a disaster that a Southern Confederacy could not have been formed at that time, when it might have won by war or concessions its liberty and independence; and thus viewed South Carolina's stand was most timely. "Whatever impedes the course of avarice and ambition will ever be denounced as rash and precipitate," declared Calhoun, "and had South Carolina delayed her resistance fifty instead of twelve years she would have heard from the same quarters the same language; but it is really surprising that those who are suffering in common with her, and who have always complained equally loudly of their grievances, who have pronounced the very acts which she has asserted within her limits to be oppressive, unconstitutional and ruinous, after so long a struggle – a struggle longer than that which preceded the separation of the States from the mother country, longer than the period of the Trojan War – should now complain of precipitancy! No, it is not South Carolina which has acted precipitately, but her sister States, who have suffered in common with her, have acted tardily."

More threatening than the tariff, however, loomed the greater question of slavery. Not only must the discussion of any specific economic question involve the rivalry between the free labour of the North and the slave labour of the South, but any discussion of regional liberty must involve the question of the protection of its peculiar institutions. "A people owning slaves are mad, or worse than mad, who do not hold their destinies in their own hands!" cried Rhett in the Convention. "Do we not bear the insolent assumption by our rulers that slave labour shall not come into competition with free? Nor is it our Northern brethren alone – the whole world are in arms against your institutions. Every stride of this Government over your rights brings it nearer and nearer to your peculiar policy. . . South Carolina must

be an armed camp. She has no rights under this Government but what she is prepared to assert in the tented field."

The reformers' "moral" attack on slavery was fundamentally economic: a demand that the South adjust herself to changed farm conditions. New England had already done so, turning her loss into gain by manufacturing. New York and Pennsylvania were using transportation and improved farming implements to make themselves independent of hired labour, buying their meat and wheat from the West and their butter and cheese from rural New York. Ohio was being developed on the small owner-worked farm principle and was growing rapidly in population, Cincinnati, the "Porkopolis of the West," already being a thriving packing-house centre.

But in the South the whole economic system was arranged on a strong credit system: planters were their own merchants, dealing direct with foreign buyers over the heads of local agents, paying in specie, turning surpluses into more land and slaves – while the North concentrated her wealth in cities, in real-estate rights, rents and banks. There was little profit in the South to be turned into mobile wealth, though: slaves raised corn, hogs ate the corn, and the slaves ate the hogs. Land that ten years before had sold for ten dollars an acre was now worth one dollar; a slave that was formerly worth a thousand dollars now brought three hundred.

Emancipation, far from being a solution, would mean catastrophe from every point of view – impoverishing slave-owners and demoralizing labour, and reducing a whole dependent black population to such wretchedness and want as to make them a more formidable menace than such slave uprisings as had occurred in Haiti, Virginia, and so recently near Charleston. Indirectly this fear affected business efficiency: not daring to employ Northern clerks in their warehouses and counting-houses because of Abolitionist propaganda, and Southern youth scorning salaried employment, merchants were compelled to employ English and French clerks who had little aptitude for or interest in the work.

The only way for the South to protect herself was to secure more slaves and more slave territory. Slave trade being forbidden by law, Charleston and New Orleans abounded in secret juntas, and six slavers steadily plied their nefarious trade, while politicians turned their talents towards the extension of slave territory – the future great Southern empire.

At the close of the Nullification Convention Turnbull declared: "Let us follow up our recent victory by preparing in time for the new conflict which sooner or later must come." It required no prophet to discern that the South was contending against a rapidly increasing nationalistic Northern majority which must eventually become anti-slavery; and that despite the latter's present deprecation of the Abolitionists as fanatics few in number, once they established Abolition as a moral principle it would straightway be incorporated into the organic law, it being a puritanic concept first to condemn on moral grounds what is meant to be destroyed for self-interest. . .

THAT summer the infamous slave thief, horse thief, and murderer, John Murrell, was tried and hanged at Jackson, Mississippi, for attempting to incite a slave rebellion. On Murrell's thumb in livid scars were the initials "HT" branded there three years before by the court that had first labelled him a criminal; and it was then, when he placed his hand on the railing and the sheriff, taking the branding-iron from the tinner's stove fetched by a Negro boy, had held it on the thumb until the skin fried, that Murrell had conceived his idea of an insurrection. . . He would continue to steal slaves; but instead of selling them he would pretend it was benevolence and thus secure the financial support of the New England Abolitionists at the same time that he revenged himself on his Southern torturers. Moreover, this would bring him more money than the sale of the Negroes. A man of his times, Murrell recognized the forces of disunion at work and realized the conflict of passions in the current social order,

and like the industrialists, looked for a way to capitalize the conflict, not avoid it.

His plan had been like himself, audacious but gross. The huskiest men whom he helped escape would form the standing army; others, old men and women, would belong to the organization. At a given signal the latter would murder the whites, old and young; then the standing army would take possession and Murrell would be the head of his "private empire." His headquarters were the Choctaw Purchase, a belt of swamp and cane brake where once Mason, Hare and the Harpes had hidden away. The land was now newly opened territory. In the fall of 1833 there would be a great land sale at Chocchuma. That would be a good time to strike. . .

Inflated with self-importance, his pockets lined with Massachusetts money, Murrell rode about the country with his few chosen white lieutenants. He wore a glossy beaver hat with a three-fourth inch brim slanted over his bright eyes, a white-skirted Bolivar coat, a shirt fastened with tape, ribbons and gold buttons, and carried a brace of silver-mounted pistols in his saddle holsters. Now his tactics were quite different since he was *using* the law for his purposes. He even posed as an itinerant preacher, mouthing evangelical phrases with no little effectiveness.

But John Murrell had blundered, and now he was to be hanged. A letter found on him from a Boston friend was incriminating: "Give the blacks an opportunity to effect a general concert of action against their tyrants and let loose the arm of destruction among them *and their property* so that the *judgments of God* may be possible! Seen and felt, it would reach the dirty heart of the tyrant."

Still Murrell's lieutenants carried on. *Lives* and *Narratives of Runaway Slaves*, all sorts of facts arranged to form a conglomerate falsehood in the way of statistics, flooded the country. Southern States had in vain invoked federal aid to prevent the post-offices being used for propaganda. The

colonial democracy was breaking up: current "liberal" notions were inspiring classes with hatred for one another.

At Vicksburg during the annual muster and barbecue of the Rifle Corps a gambler started the insurrection at the zero hour. At the last moment, however, he was left alone by his frightened followers. The gambler was beaten and imprisoned. At Memphis, "Smoky Row" began to swarm with life as if by magic: a crowd of blacks led by Northern fanatics tried to burn the courthouse. They were dispersed without bloodshed. Still the Southern whites went their way unsuspecting.

At Natchez, set like a gem in a mass of black willow, ash, water maple, paw-paw, pecan, locust, magnolia, tulip tree, oak, palmetto, red cedar and yapan, where Spanish grandees in red sashes mingled with tall cotton planters in white blanket-coats and broad white hats, and in the lower town, set on a clay shelf below the lighthouse, where gamblers and river alligators drank and fought and made love in their "Devil's Punch Bowl," men went about talking in whispers, for hell had been escaped by a hair's breadth. . . Christmas had been set for the insurrection, but the plotters were impatient to begin the slaughter. The past June, the wife of a Madison County (Mississippi) planter had overheard one of the coloured labourers telling the nurse of her four-year-old son that it would be her task to kill the child, and the nurse was tearfully protesting. Without hesitating, the mistress called for her mount and rode for her husband. Quietly all the white planters were informed. Quickly they organized.

For days without ceasing committees worked to uncover the ghastly plot. Strapped to a table, Negroes and Abolitionists under the black-snake lash confessed all the details. The committee rooms reeked with blood and echoed with continual screams of pain. The floors were covered with slippery gore. Grim with passion and strain, the white men went about their task. Beyond lashing no violence was resorted to, and the law was allowed to take its course.

The new leader was finally found and brought to trial: a New Englander by the name of Joshua Cotton. At his trial he screamed defiance at his Southern captors, denouncing slavery in bitter words.

After he had been hanged, someone remembered that Joshua Cotton had brought a wife with him from the North. At first it was thought he had murdered her; and strangely enough, at his trial Cotton had seemed to want that belief to prevail. Eventually, however, she was found. The reformer had sold her to a trader for a small sum of money.

XVI

THOUGH the bank bill was dead, not so the Monster of Chestnut Street whose twenty-nine tentacles reached out as branches over all the country, and whose guardians, listed as beneficiaries, included more than fifty members of Congress, editors of prominent Northern newspapers, and scores of hack writers. So arrogant were the bank men that Jackson saw he must kill the leviathan as well as its cause; and, declaring that the bank was unsafe for the people's money, he shifted his Secretary of the Treasury until he got one—Roger B. Taney of Maryland—who was willing to make the withdrawal of government funds.

President Biddle of the bank retaliated by ordering the curtailment of loans. In the South and West, where the loans were urgently needed to move the autumn crops, the curtailment was double that in the North. Business failures began to occur; workmen were discharged, and a small panic ensued. Rates rose from six to fifteen per cent. in an effort to force Jackson to restore the deposits. There was even talk of impeaching the President.

Finally, when interest had risen as high as twenty-four per cent. public indignation could be no longer restrained. Webster and Clay, who had jubilantly approved of Biddle's callousness, now did a somersault to regain their popularity

and coolly informed Biddle that his cause was hopeless. From Philadelphia went out the order to the branch banks to suspend the punitive measures "in order that we may save our beloved country from the curse of Vanburenism." But financial piracy had again overstepped its mark: as it became apparent that the whole panic had been due to a few men wanting a certain financial system to prevail, friendship to the bank was enough to damn any party. Calhoun, who had supported the bank because he believed that properly managed it would be a check upon promiscuous "private" banking, and that at least it would exert a mild conservative influence, stuck to his guns – and was again left to defend his position alone. . .

JACKSON now turned his belligerency upon France where, politeness being valued even in politics, anger was flaming against the United States because of the extravagant language of the President in regard to the debts. The French, dissembling to strike a good bargain, now absolutely refused to meet their obligations, though under the terms of the treaty they had been profiting by easy duties on wine imports into the United States for which they had promised to pay what they owed. There was talk of sending a fleet to the West Indies to protect their property which Jackson had threatened to seize. Old Hickory, probably advised to do so by Louis Philippe, wrote a note to France that showed his teeth, and undertook to back it up by asking Congress for an emergency appropriation to meet the danger. The bill passed the Democratic House but in the Whig Senate it was made the football of party politics by Clay and Webster whose filibustering prevented a vote before Congress adjourned. It was on that day – without a penny having been appropriated for national defence in the face of a possible war – that Jackson ordered Secretary of State Forsythe to send an ultimatum to France. England offered to mediate, and eventually Jackson won his point and France paid. But again the Whig-Republicans had

outraged national pride by playing politics with an international crisis. Webster was especially excoriated, and had to spend his whole vacation writing an elaborate defence. The Democrats were preparing to go after Webster when, to their amazement, John Quincy Adams assumed the defence of the administration he had formerly denounced so scathingly. Putting aside personal animosity to the man and abusive disapproval of the President, the "Old Man Eloquent," who had been resurrected from the politically dead by the Anti-Masons and whom no one took seriously, addressed the House in so spirited a defence of national integrity and loyalty, and so scathingly denounced Webster and Clay, that even the Whig-Republicans were silenced. It was a repetition of Adams's courage of twenty-five years before when he had warned Jefferson that the Federalists were trying to undermine the Union – a height he was to ascend once again when he rose to assail the "Gag Rule" a year hence – and having ascended it, he promptly descended again to his petty resentful attitude. In a less puritanic, unctuous, self-righteous and opinionated man Adams's excellent qualities would have carried another – Webster, for example – to great heights, for he was of spotless probity, completely independent of party, scholarly, vibrant, contumacious, incorruptible, statesmanlike, and patriotic. But without the wiles of a schemer or the personal attractiveness necessary for "mixing" and popular leadership, this tubby, bald-headed old man with his high cheek-bones and aquiline nose enjoyed doing his duty (as conceived by his Puritan conscience) and telling the truth (which he often confused with his mere opinion) too well to get along with others: consequently, his was a troubled spirit, constantly suspicious of infamy in other men as conspirators against himself or as plotting evil to just causes he espoused. A specimen of rugged individualism who, as the Marquess of Wellesley himself admitted to the Lords, showed an astonishing superiority over the British during the whole of the negotiations at Ghent in 1814, Adams had lingered too long on the

scene – a survivor of the golden age reproving a new generation less regardful of the old standards as did Cato the Elder many centuries before. . .

THE "gag" row was first precipitated at the end of 1835 – the "Mob Year," the Abolitionist literature called it, though with the exception of Garrison being dragged to jail through the streets of Boston with a rope around his neck, there had been no more violence towards these fanatics than was usual – when Jackson in his annual message invited attention to the "painful excitement produced in the South by attempts to circulate through the mails inflammatory bills addressed to the passions of slaves . . . calculated to stimulate them to insurrection and introduce all the horrors of a servile war," and recommended the passage of such a law as would curtail this subversive propaganda. In the Senate the matter was referred to a special committee of which Calhoun was chairman, and the latter reported a bill making it a penal offence for any postmaster knowingly to receive and put into the mail any publication going to a State whose laws forbade it. The bill was rejected by a close margin as infringing on the freedom of the press. Only three Northern senators voted for the bill.

On February 6, 1837 – the year in which the Reverend Elijah Lovejoy was murdered and his Abolitionist press destroyed – John Quincy Adams rose to address the speaker, stating that he held in his hand a paper purporting to come from slaves, and he desired a decision as to the rules of the House respecting such petitions. Immediately the Southern members were thrown into a rage, and declared that Adams ought to be brought to the bar of the House and censured. Waddy Thompson of South Carolina stated that Adams's conduct was properly the subject of inquiry by the grand jury of the District of Columbia as it would be under the laws of South Carolina. Adams answered this with grave dignity: "Where is your law which says the mean, the low

and the degraded shall be deprived of the right of petition? Where in the Land of Freemen was the right of petition ever based on the exclusive basis of morality and virtue? Petition is supplication – it is entreaty – it is prayer – and where is the degree of vice or immorality which shall deprive the citizen of the right to supplicate for a boon, to pray for mercy? It does not belong to the most abject despotism and there is no absolute monarch on earth who is not compelled by the constitution of his country to receive the petitions of his people. The Sultan of Constantinople cannot walk the streets and refuse to receive the petitions of the meanest and vilest in the land."

Adams obviously had a right principle to defend – the constitutional right of petition which had been included in the Bill of Rights – but he overworked it in both practice and theory, having at one session five years before introduced as many as fifteen memorials for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia, and in theory attributing to Congress a Sultanic power to receive and answer such "prayers." In this particular instance, it was not until after four days of acrimonious debate that it dawned upon the House that Adams had not actually presented a petition but merely asked the opinion of the Speaker as to whether it came within the rules; and even then, when the petition was investigated, it was found to be a hoax which some jokers had perpetrated upon the honest old man.

Calhoun, knowing that the right to receive petitions presumed the right to consider them, and that this precedent applied to slavery was to test the power of Congress in emancipating in the District of Columbia as a preliminary to extending that power in the territories, thought the question of enough importance to enter the lists. He presented his lengthy argument both as to theory and practice; maintaining first that the right of petition itself "does not go any farther than the presentation of it," and second, that most of the petitions presented were "frivolous and not made with any ex-

pectation of favourable action." (Adams himself often prefaced the introduction of petitions by the remark that he did not agree with their contents, thus admitting that he was taking up the time of Congress with something that served no good or useful purpose, but on the contrary, produced ill feeling.) "Deprive deliberative bodies of the essential and primary right to determine what to receive and what to reject," said Calhoun, "and they would become passive receptacles, indifferently, of all that is frivolous, unconstitutional, immoral, impious, as well as what may properly demand their deliberation and action. . . What would be the consequence? If a petition should be presented praying the abolition of the Constitution (which we are all bound by our oaths to protect), according to this abominable doctrine it must be received. So, if it prayed the abolition of the Decalogue or the Bible itself." When James Buchanan of Pennsylvania presented a petition from the Quaker Abolition Society asking for the emancipation of slaves in the District of Columbia, with the recommendation that the petition be rejected without consideration, Calhoun reproved even this warm friend of the South: "The Senator from Pennsylvania has fallen on a device to receive this petition and immediately reject it *without consideration* or reflection. To my mind, the movement looks like a trick—a mere piece of artifice to juggle and deceive."

But the question was still not settled. The following year when William Slade introduced in the House the resolutions of the Vermont Legislature, accompanied by various memorials, favouring the suppression of slavery and the slave trade in the District of Columbia, it precipitated the angriest debate (according to Benton) that had ever occurred in the legislative halls, a debate so bitter that after adjournment the Southern members held a caucus to consider the dissolution of the Union. The anti-slavery members now saw that they had gone too far; and the next day Rule 21, known as the "Atherton Gag," stating that any petition or memorandum

touching slavery should on presentation be laid on the table, was adopted and followed for seven years. . .

In the meantime the twisted finger of Destiny having written *finis* to the chapter of colonial confederacy, was beginning a new chapter in the history of empire, entitled *Texas*.

In this northeastern province of Mexico land was absurdly cheap and Mexico had welcomed colonization. The only requirement to hold land had been to be a Roman Catholic; and Father Muldoon of New Orleans made a specialty of preparing Americans for Mexican citizenship. The Austins with their colony of twenty thousand whites and two thousand slaves (slavery though prohibited by law was accepted in fact) had been enthusiastically received. Moses had died just as the colony was being founded, at the time of the revolt against Spain; but his son Stephen carried on, an unselfish leader who established American civilization in a wilderness without the aid of a single soldier to repel hostile Indians or a single dollar from the public treasury to pay subordinates, enduring all manner of hardships and injustices for the sake of his ideal. Among the Americans who adopted Mexico was Captain David Porter, who was made commander of the Mexican naval forces – whatever they might have been. The native Mexican population consisted of Indians and a few Spanish explorers and exploiters, neither of whom had any capacity for self-government. The preponderance of American settlers was calculated sooner or later to sever this northeastern section from Mexico and annex it to the United States; and since the immigrants were largely from the South, this new State – as large as the German Empire – was counted on, when divided into several smaller states, to increase the prestige of the slave States.

The new constitution of San Felipe de Austin was the silver trumpet in the night, and the new conquistador with ambitions to revel in the halls of the Montezumas was the swashbuckling soldier of fortune, poet of action, the ro-

mantic sentimentalist Sam Houston whose advent in Texas had been prophetically hailed by a local newspaper as the "signal for an uprising." Stephen Austen, cultured colonizer and gentle follower of the rainbow, though the most deserving and capable leader in Texas, was swept aside for Houston who was enthusiastically appointed commanding officer east of the Trinity River. Had not Houston himself introduced a clause in the constitution forbidding the legislature to establish banks, thus protecting the new country from the very beginning against ruthless capitalism? No one would have believed that their hero was the lawyer for the Galveston & Texas Land Company headed by powerful New York banks, which held the monopoly of selling stock to a favoured few and land-script to the small fry.

Texas, the last support of the old Mexican Constitution, had finally found the strain on her loyalty too great; and though the "General Consolidation" of October 1835 was careful to declare against absolute independence, the Mexican authorities were not deceived by the play for time and began to make preparations to punish the Texan rebels for establishing a provisional government. Aid, almost entirely from the South, began to pour into the Lone State. "La Grays" of Louisiana volunteered, and French-speaking citizens sent their passionate protestations of sympathy. Mass meetings were held in all the towns of Texas; enlistments were taken, rifles offered, maidens' hair and sashes tied to the bayonets. James Dickson started from Canada with sixty men across Minnesota with the avowed intention of organizing the Indians and attacking Mexico to liberate Texas. Adventurous young men with a taste for fighting and boasting began to converge from all quarters. But in the main it was a "lone war" by the homogeneous and independent new Southwest, a country as different from the new Northwest as the old South had been different from the old North. Here the settlers had brought an Eighteenth Century culture, crude with transplanting but not transformed, with its agrarian distrust of city life, its

strong separatist sentiments, and its pride of independence. Never having asked, and never received, any help from the central Government in fighting the more settled, if not the more savage, forces of the wilderness, it never occurred to them now to expect much aid from the central Government; and as independently as they had conquered the forces of the wilderness, so would they now conquer the forces of Mexico. . .

In the following spring a convention at New Washington declared for complete independence. The forty-year-old Jalapan, General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna, President of Mexico and Commander of the Army of Occupation, took personal charge of the troops and the initiative in order swiftly to put an end to the defiance. The die was now cast.

Across the river from San Antonio the little fourteen-gun fort known as the Alamo, formerly a mission and a church, was taken over by Captain Potter, a resident of Matamoras. The regular recruits, two companies of volunteers, the remnants of the New Orleans Grays under Colonel Travis, assigned by the Governor to take charge, James Bowie who as a full colonel had been instrumental in clearing Texas of Mexicans before the final declaration of independence, J. N. Sequin of San Antonio with a skeleton organization of a new company, J. B. Bonham of South Carolina with a few followers, good-natured Davy Crockett, and a final force from Gonzales, all brought the defending force up to *one hundred and twenty-eight* men. There was a row between Travis and Bowie as to who should command, in which the latter won (largely because of his personal popularity for having killed Major Morris Wright with a large file), only to fall ill soon afterward with pneumonia.

The Mexican main army-of-occupation moved from Laredo in four detachments, the two superior detachments being sent to the west side of the river to take the Alamo. What followed there was a mixed farce and tragedy. For ten days the force of little more than a hundred held the fort, under con-

tinual bombardment, against a Mexican force estimated at from fifteen hundred to six thousand, without a single casualty. On March 6, however, as the south guns were engaged in answering the enemy batteries, there was an unexpected blast of bugle music immediately followed by the whirring tramp of rushing soldiers. The fort doors crashed in before the moving mass of attackers, and amid the crack of rifle and the hiss of bullets Santa Anna's band could be heard sounding the dreaded note *deguello*—No Quarter!

Travis was found at his post, the gun at the northeast angle, with a single shot in his forehead, his murderer's bayoneted corpse stretched beside him. Crockett was dead in the west battery. Bowie was butchered on his sick-couch which he had had moved among the defenders. Those whom the bullets had missed or merely wounded were quickly dispatched by the gleaming Mexican bayonets. Thermopylæ had had its messenger of defeat; the Alamo had none. The sole survivor, a young man with a baby in his arm, attempted to escape through the chapel windows; but, discovered and shot, both crashed down to the stone pavement below. Then in the chapel there was silence, and the light thinly filtered in upon the dust on the floor.

When the victors finally pulled down the flag they saw that it was the *Mexican* Federal flag of 1824. The dead heroes had not even known they were fighting for a dead symbol: that four days before, the Convention had declared the independence of Texas and adopted the Lone Star flag. . .

The news of the Alamo inflamed public sentiment as no amount of propaganda could ever have accomplished; and marching on the crest of this feeling, the Texas main army of about eight hundred men and two hundred bayonets, under the command of General Houston who had a showman's instinct to seize the dramatic incident necessary to initiate any way, hurried south to meet the enemy. The Mexicans, to show their contempt for the miserable contending force, sent

only an advance guard of their great and splendidly equipped army to intercept Houston. But at the same time they were cautious enough to make the guard adequate – fifteen hundred of their best infantry and cavalry.

Santa Anna's force crossed the San Jacinto River and encamped on the peninsula formed by the river and Buffalo Bayou, in the angle of which stood the town of New Washington. Fortunately for the Texans a heavy freshet served to cut off this force from the main army. The Texas force, advancing from the opposite direction, crossed the bayou in a leaky scow and on a timber raft (the horses had to swim) and encamped at the Mexicans' rear. Deaf Smith, the Scout, was then dispatched with a squad to cut down the one bridge. There was to be no retreat.

On April 21 the Texans' pathetic two-gun battery was set. At four in the afternoon Captain Mirabeau Bonaparte Lamar of South Carolina, with his cavalry squadron of eighty, was to lead the advance, the infantry following with guns at a trail, Thomas J. Rusk, Secretary of War, commanding on the left, and Burleson Sherman on the right. Houston, wearing a shabby black coat and black-velvet vest, with snuff-coloured pantaloons tucked in his boots, rode up and down the front of his troops on a white horse, attended by a valet, with his precious *Gulliver's Travels* and Cæsar's *Commentaries* stuffed in his saddle-bag, brandishing a huge sword and yelling at his impatient men: "Hold your fire, damn you!"

At the zero hour the army band (a drum and a fife) struck up the martial air *Will You Come Into My Bower?* and with one yell the Texan army of seven hundred and eighty-two men, their white-silk flag emblazoned with the emblem of liberty in the lead, pounced upon the amazed Mexicans who, never dreaming that they would be attacked by so inferior a force, had relaxed for the night, their horses corralled, their arms stacked, their leader Santa Anna asleep, while the soldiers drowsed over their fires awaiting the hot supper their cooks were busily preparing. With stupefied terror they

now realized that the crackle they were hearing was not the cozy crepitation of their camp-fires and the pleasant sizzling of frying steaks, but the rattle of canister and grape being fired at short range, and the swish of rifle shot through branches and twigs, and the whiz of clubbed muskets descending upon Mexican heads. A Mexican cavalry officer tried to muster some defence, but Captain Lamar, riding in their midst, stampeded the horses and drove their riders into the mire of the bayou where they were shot. "Show no quarter!" rang out the order; and, "Remember the Alamo!" was the response of the ebullient Texans. A row of flaming orange jets rushed from the woods and expired in the air; a thin, dotted grey line sagged in the grass and tightened. In fifteen minutes the battle was over. Santa Anna had escaped, but six hundred and thirty of his men lay dead, two hundred and eight were wounded, seven hundred and thirty were prisoners: in all, seventeen hundred casualties and prisoners. Eight Texans had been killed and twenty-five wounded. The Alamo was avenged.

General Houston lay in his tent submitting to the painful amputation of his smashed leg without anaesthetic while he hummed *Will You Come Into My Bower?* and wove a wreath of leaves from the plain of St. Hyacinth for a young lady of his acquaintance. A Mexican woman who owned the land thereabouts was brought in to voice a demand that the dead be removed at once.

"We have covered your fields with glory, ma'am," said Houston.

"With stinking corpses!" cried the woman furiously.

A prisoner was produced, a small insignificant man in blue smock and red-felt peasant slippers. At sight of him all the other Mexicans rose and bowed low. "El Presidente," they murmured respectfully. Santa Anna glared resentfully at his stupid countrymen.

"Shall we hang him, sir?" an American officer asked Houston.

"No; we shall treat with him," smiled Houston. He called for an ear of corn at which he picked thoughtfully. Soldiers gathered up the grains to take home and plant to immortalize in corn the name *San Jacinto*.

Twelve days before the autumn election of 1836 Houston returned to Nacogdoches. On October 22 he was inaugurated President of the Republic of Texas under the new constitution legalizing slavery. The impresario, Stephen Austin, was made Secretary of State, an office he held until his death three months later. In the following March the United States recognized Texas's independence. Free land was offered to American settlers and annexation immediately proposed, much to the indignation of the anti-slavery Northerners whose bitterness did not permit them to see the glory of Texas's lone struggle for independence against overwhelming odds. Even Jackson refused to commit himself about annexation, and it was also obvious that his successor, Van Buren, would not risk his political career by taking a definite stand in a matter that involved such intense sectional feeling. Henry Clay, on the Whig side, also refused to commit himself; so it appeared likely that Texas would remain out of the Union indefinitely. . .

In the last years of Old Hickory's reign many of the old guard vanished from the scene and were replaced by new men. Lafayette, Coleridge, Lamb, Crawford, Burr, Madison and Marshall had died; Lincoln was entering his State Legislature, Seward was pronouncing Lafayette's eulogy, Jefferson Davis was eloping with the daughter of General Zachary Taylor and retiring from the Army to his Mississippi plantation, Toombs was acquitting himself in the Creek War in Georgia.

Under the guise of equality and popular democracy Jackson had largely succeeded in establishing a monarchy with all the caprices and inequalities that a monarchical system implied, despite the fact that manhood suffrage had been made uni-

versal. Public offices and financial control had been wrested from the real or self-constituted aristocracy, but the platform of "easy money" and the developments by private initiative were at the same time laying the foundations for a new moneyed aristocracy. The last installment of the national debt being paid, and with no internal improvements on which to spend the money that was still coming in from the tariff of 1833 and from France, and there being as yet no independent treasury system to hoard the surplus, the public funds above five million dollars (twenty-five million in all) were distributed to State banks — though there was a constitutional objection to Congress raising money by taxation for the States! With the growing need of transportation for the markets — a need the federal Government was not empowered by the Constitution to meet, and private enterprise not being sufficiently advanced to care for it — the individual States were the logical agencies to supply the demand for currency and credit. With the routing of the Indians and the rise of easy land, a new occasion had arisen for speculation and for the feverish prosperity which the demand for more credit easily satisfied. A period of wild-cat banking set in: "private banks" appeared overnight, sometimes no more than a single adventurer with a satchelful of blanks, anxious to share in the spoils. Truly, the Monster of Chestnut Street had turned out to be a tarantula carrying its numerous young on its back which escaped when the parent was killed! Whatever good the bank had possesssed — perhaps a slight conservative restraint — was now lost. No two State banking laws were the same: Minnesota had State banks, Wisconsin had no banks. Naturally there was an excessive issue of bank-notes: "Rag Money" began to pour out as fast as the presses could print it, and soon there were a hundred and forty different kinds — not counting the counterfeit — flooding the country. An enterprising Philadelphia firm, Bickwell, got out a guide or *Bank-Note Detector* describing which dollar notes were worth fifty cents, which worth ten cents, and which worth nothing.

In an attempt to stop the wild speculation Jackson issued his *Specie Circular* directing that all public lands must be paid for in gold, silver, or notes of specie-paying banks. The old General's last official act before leaving his capable but badly harassed successor to hold the bag was to sign the bill recognizing Texas – an appropriate gesture to the new empire by the man who had done most to doom the old colonial confederacy. His return to the *Hermitage* at Nashville and his beloved Rachel's tomb was a triumphal procession. Verily, the Lord had smitten down all his enemies – especially Calhoun.

In Utica the first Whig Convention joined the procession of pragmatic political parties to serve for a day and then be gathered up as fragments by the future National-Republican Party. But that time not yet being in its fulness, the following March saw Van Buren driving to the Capital in an elegant phaeton made of oak from the original timbers of the *U. S. S. Constitution* presented to him by New York admirers and drawn by Jackson's four carriage-horses in brass-mounted harness . . . to begin reaping the whirlwind of his late predecessor's wind-bag prosperity.

The brilliant Frenchman, Alexis de Tocqueville, travelling in America, declared: "The American makes a trade even of agriculture; he tills to sell. All being engaged in industry, the least shock to business puts the private fortune of each one in jeopardy, and hence shakes the State. Panics constitute an endemic disease of the democratic nations of the time. It cannot be cured. It does not originate in incidental circumstances but in the temperament of these nations. . . The republican government is the slow and quiet action of society upon itself. It is the regular state of things founded upon the enlightened will of the people. A conciliatory government is that in which resolutions are allowed time to ripen, and in which they are deliberately discussed and executed with mature judgment. . . The majority is limited in the moral world by humanity, justice and reason; in the political

world by vested rights. To reverse these conditions would be to repudiate democracy, and the magistrate's power, since he would not then be answerable to the people, would be tyranny; for as Montesquieu observes, nothing is more absolute than the authority of a prince who succeeds a republic."

In other words, the Calhouns and de Tocquevilles recognized that the warring dualism of man's nature – man and the Holy Ghost; brutality and stupidity, and an apprehension of divine justice and all forms of art; selfishness and greed, and a capacity for self-sacrifice – would cause him to be irretrievably lost to either one influence or the other of his dualistic nature except for his genius for fusion. But such fusion was not instinctive: rather, it was the classical ethical unity or the Christian spiritual unity; and since society was but a reflection of the individual man, and progress never automatic, the same principle of unity must regulate collective life to avoid confusion. Thus the moral limitation upon democracy.

To the unethical and unspiritual multitude, however, regarding themselves as the instruments of heaven and their work as not design but manifest destiny, the Calhouns and the de Tocquevilles were heretical in asserting that there was a unity not dependent on the people; and, in their effort to regulate the speed of progress, treasonable in denying the very heart of American cultural independence and "purified interests," speed being the outward manifestation of an inner childish optimism that necessitated stilling all criticism. Thus "Manifest Destiny" became the dark apology for all errors, the deliberate volition of men whose interests, ambitions, and ideas were in themselves varied and unpredictable compounds. It was the Millennium; and a millennium, as all believers knew, was ushered in by a period of social upheaval – wars and rumours of war, plagues, pestilence and famine – to prepare for the coming of angels with a great sound of trumpet to gather together the Elect from the four winds. Government was not assembled like a clock to work precisely, nor was the social creed manufactured out of a whole cloth;

but the one grew miraculously like a sturdy oak from a minute acorn, and the other was made shift of like a patchwork.

More popular with the multitude, therefore, were the Macaulays and the Websters, and the successful men of the world who, chameleon-like, took their colour from one another. "The fact is," observed the English Whig, "that when men in treating of things which cannot be circumscribed by precise definitions adopt this mode of reasoning; when once they begin to talk of power, happiness, misery, pain, pleasure, motives, objects of desire, as they talk of lines and numbers, there is no end to the contradictions and absurdities they fall into. There is no proposition so monstrously untrue in morals or politics that we will not undertake to prove it by something which shall sound like logical demonstration from admitted principles."

Webster, unable to meet the logic of Calhoun, thus chose the most effective weapon—appealing in splendid oratory to the pride and glory of the future—to end the Union and establish a Nation. But progress cannot be charted because it has no law save custom; and the solid wall of conservatism always suffers a slow change so that it loses as it gains, and never progresses in eternity. Men who build railroads forget how to walk, and those who make watches cannot tell the time from the sun. Like the Tuscany ranks, it is ever those in the rear who must cry, "Forward!" . . .

THE millennium bubble was steadily expanding to the bursting point. The population of the country had increased to ten million, nearly three million of which were immigrants who continued on to the Ohio and Lake regions or remained in Northern industrial centres—presenting a field for class hatreds which Morse, the telegraph inventor, returning from Augsburg, unhappily sought to agitate by publishing his *Foreign Conspiracy Against the United States.* Industry was beginning to boom: mills had made looms and spinning wheels disappear, and labour, now numbering three hundred thou-

sand, was advancing its organization for agitation and strikes (which Marshall just before his death had declared in *The People vs. Fisher* to be illegal!) and publishing their own organ in New York, George Evans's *Workingmen's Advocate.* New inventions were continuing to appear: the Napier Press and the Colt Revolver; the friction match to replace the flint-and-tinder; Melodeons to taunt the metamorphosized Puritan devil; McCormick's Reaper and other farm machinery to multiply the output of the soil and revolutionize farming; while new steamship lines and railroads carried the increased supplies to the sources of demand. New York and Pennsylvania were beginning geological surveys; education, assisted by the fine new rotary presses, was becoming more and more general; the New England Culture Movement was inaugurated; the *Southern Literary Messenger* was established at Richmond, and James Gordon Bennett's *Herald* at New York.

Emigration to the West, encouraged by Jackson's land-grabbing policy, now became a rush due to the depression that followed his administration and the successful Texan revolt; and the rallying cry "Manifest Destiny!" was again raised as history repeated itself and hordes of earth-hungry emigrants poured into the Great Valley: from the South through the Cumberland Gap to the Northwest, but chiefly through Alabama and Mississippi to the Southwest; from the North, by shallow-draft and narrow broadhorn and keel-boat on the clear waters of the Ohio River and its tributaries, into Ohio and beyond to the open spaces north and west of the rivers where the great prairies stretched like huge mosaics composed of thousands of varieties of flowers framed in tall cotton trees festooned with ivy, and less often down the muddy waters of the Mississippi to the malarial cane-brakes of the delta and the plains of Texas.

Gentlemen with their caravans and slaves seeking greater kingdoms; tall bearded farmers and strong-limbed settlers with their nimble-tongued women and smutty-browed brats;

trappers, hunters and peddlers; men tall and pale like the cypress trees that grew in their swamps; smooth speculators, land-buyers, traders and politicians; philosophers, idealists and dreamers of a new Utopia; teachers and preachers and "improving" Puritans or missionaries of the recently formed Methodist Missionary Society, distributing Bibles and "literature" and exhorting against drinking and gambling and loafing, serving their temporal interests at the same time they spread a Christianity that was a compound of emotional optimism and conventional morality with the emphasis upon mere goodness of heart rather than doctrine; bandits, river rats, scoundrels of every hue; Yankees, Pennsylvanians and German immigrants moving generally into the new Northwest while Virginians and Carolinians went to the Southwest, and in both the dominating Scotch-Irish distinctive pioneer and empire-builder, self-assertive, self-sufficient, sombre, austere, rowdy, religious, in whose nature individualism and communism continually warred: all a vast fraternity of native Americans (for the most part), increasing at the rate of a million each decade, bound together with an elemental impulse, the "Western Fever," to get something for nothing (naively represented as faith to invest in America that proved their patriotism and earned the right to quadruple their investment), mingling in an instinctive groping after a new national aggregate in a life of pioneer equality that was free, mobile, dangerous and starved—a strange and paradoxical combination of democracy and empire extending over a valley two thousand miles wide with a unified river system four thousand miles long.

In so free and buoyant a country of horizons unrestricted by tradition and the past it was inevitable that men should live mainly for the present. Their world being as nature had made it, there was no artificial cultural restraint upon the romantic instinct to revert to the barbarisms of nature; and existence being as transitory as the wild life about them, it was necessary to seize the day and defend life by direct

action—that is, by violence. In those sections where the Seminoles and Cherokees had been bodily thrust out as anachronistic races impeding progress, murders were increasing at a terrifying rate; while lawlessness was accompanied by a peculiar self-righteous love of *laws* that permitted Judge Lynch's self-appointed commission to be stretched to the point of self-appointed *individuals* to dispense the law. Dorothy Dix started a tour of the country to harangue against branding criminals on the face and lashing the insane.

Social life was not simple but starved. Most of the homes were log cabins with chinked-log walls, puncheon floors, clay windows, and no chimneys—the smoke escaping through clapboards. The furniture consisted of split-bottom chairs, halved-log tables, and bedsteads of unhewn logs. A string of buffalo hides served as a partition when one was thought necessary. The men, slovenly of dress (one pair of buckskin breeches and two tow-cloth shirts constituted a sizeable wardrobe) and boastful and rude of speech, worked hard, guffawed and stamped when they were pleased, were sullen and violent when angry, and found their chief emotional outlet in swilling and bullying. The women, in plain linsey-gowns, their hair tightly coiled, baked hoe-cakes and journey-cakes to be served with the broilings of hung beef, rashers of bacon, or collops of venison; brewed coffee from Evans root and dried pea-pods, and found their chief emotional outlet in child-bearing. Every family had its great brood of children, whose costume consisted of a nightgown-like tunic with two splits to distinguish the boys. Starved spiritually, these pioneers would drive twenty miles for a frolic—a roof-raising, a corn-shucking, or a camp-meeting. The latter was the chief event of the year, lasting sometimes four or five days, and being organized with exhorters and workers on a scale that provided a glorious orgy that had not only a good but a religious reputation—an imagined justification that was part of the blight of Puritanism which, with its fetishes of uniformity and prohibition, lay like a pall over the greater

part of Western life. At the same time the natural tendency of man to think well of himself was, unchecked by external evidence of the slow and painstaking effort by which creative genius builds up a dynamic civilization, producing a definite native conceit: lost in time these pioneers merely drifted on the good ship *Opportunism* without its reliable rudder *History*, exulting in God's winds and man's sails by which they were being so rapidly conveyed . . . they knew not whither. And yet the soul of man, like the dark gem it is, absorbs every ray of light though it dazzles not; and if there was ignorance, boastfulness, barbarity, and even moral laxity in the new country, there was at the same time a boundless vitality, rough humour, and a heroism so usual as to be commonplace. And if the law was a vague conceit, and justice (as dispensed by a regulator from a *Justice's Hand-Book*) more or less a matter of personal bias that as frequently persecuted the innocent as prosecuted the guilty; and if honesty was more a matter of openness of intention, and generosity the spirit of the drunken man who calls friend even the thief picking his pocket, to those who looked deeper than the surface the principle of *Equity* was writ large upon the Western soul.

In the process of turning a wilderness into a civilized expression, of combining the excellencies of solid contentment of primitivism with civilization's knowledge, elasticity of mind, and power over natural environment, men, to take root, must first be brought down by the dark forces of the wilderness to a level where the penetrating light shines upon one facet of the soul at a time, so that when the soil's compactness is stirred about the root, growth to high spiritual and intellectual resolutions is stimulated. Thus the dynamic element in human progress is a mystic force, and social forces play upon man as physical forces upon matter and substance.

If, therefore, the new Western democracy was lusty and restless and unconscious of its own organization and destiny,

it was moving forward with a strong community of purpose, and in time would settle down to a recognition of the established order from which it sprang – flourishing to a product similar to that of the cluster from which the bulb was separated for transplanting. In the Southwest the political economy of Jefferson and the agrarian culture of the South (including yeoman farmer, planter and slave) was becoming more and more dominant; while in the Northwest, largely settled under paternal federal support in the way of protective tariffs and internal improvements, the New England communistic precepts were dominant – on a much larger scale as befitted a country of unrestricted horizons. And as the West grew, the dominant ideals of the countries it had transplanted grew. Already of a total population of thirteen million in the Union one-third were Westerners; and if the Old West (the western parts of Virginia, Carolina, Georgia, New York and Pennsylvania, which were still western in sentiment) were included, then one-half of the total national population was Western. Forty-seven of the two hundred and thirteen votes in the House were Western; eighteen of the forty-eight seats in the Senate.

While the civilizing hand of the churches was being stretched forth to the West, schools and colleges were being built. The liberal land grants of the federal Government were made to serve the cause of the common schools, while institutions of higher learning flourished at Lexington, Natchez, Granville (Ohio), and Hanover (Indiana). Books found their way to the Athens of the West (as Lexington was called), and in time the Mechanics' Library was founded there under the guidance of Henry Clay. "Frenchtown," as St. Louis was called, had a population of ten thousand; and there at the French Academy young ladies were taught Good Order and Propriety at Meals, Lessons of Morality, Analysis of Particles, and Hair-Weaving. Also to be found there were a Mercantile Library, a newspaper, and gazette stores where drawing-pencils were on sale. The Maysville

Eagle, the Louisville *Advertiser*, and the St. Louis *Republican* carried their weekly or semi-weekly gossip and political news to nearby villages and distant settlements. People were taking up Josiah Holbroke's *New England Lyceum Movement;* the young ladies read Fanny Burney's *Evelina* and Burghes's *Dignity of Human Nature*, and even mentioned Byron and Shelley and Keats in a guarded way. Occasionally a Fourier Phalanx was to be found.

Roads were steadily improving and expanding the area of productive farming, though nearly all led to the river ports or the old fort towns such as La Porte, Indiana, or Detroit and Cleveland on the Lakes. The Erie and Ohio Canals were turning exports and communication northeastward, while the Lake steamers were adding their share to the development of the Western frontier. Cincinnati, with a population like St. Louis of ten thousand, was the "Porkopolis" of the West, the centre of pork packing and manufacturing sending its salted meats and farm implements to the plantations of the lower South in ever-increasing volume. The great river steamers, the *City of New Orleans* and the *Crescent* (which the preachers compared to ancient Babylon as centres of vice) were the marvels of the West, carrying their cargoes of grain, tobacco and cotton which crowded the wharves of New Orleans with its tonnage three times that of New York.

New Orleans was the meeting place of the East and West, the Northwest and Southwest. A city of forty thousand, including fifteen thousand quadroons, it spread with but the vaguest outline in a forest of brilliant paw-paws and palmettos hooked through with wild-grape vines and draped with Spanish moss; its houses built of cypress-wood and shingled, or on the River where the more prosperous dwelt, of burnt-brick with galleries encircling the upper-part Spanish-style; its old Cathedral where the early Creole Ursulines had prayed, and where General Jackson and his staff had stood in 1815 during the chanting of a solemn *Te Deum* to commemorate his vic-

tory; its Théâtre St. Philippe where the Duke de Saxe-Wiemar was entertained a few years before, and the French Theatre started by San Domingo refugees in 1791; its new magnificent show-boats giving performances of Shakespeare and Chapman; its colourful *bals;* its outdoor fish-grills on the shell-road; its narrow streets, dark and mysterious and noisy, with their licentiously painted walls lined with coffee-shops in which mingled garlanded Creoles, trappers in buck-skin, red-shirted flatboatmen, pig-tailed marines, blanketed Indians, and slaves wearing enormous ear-rings; its arcaded alleys of the market-place where handsome *cuarterons* vended cakes, bananas, figs, pineapples and cocoanuts in great baskets carried on their heads; its rue Marigny bordered with chinaberry trees with their fragrant lilac-like blossoms, beneath which strolled beautiful Creoles wearing petticoats of gold lace, richly tasseled, and stockings interwoven with gold thread, and headdresses of gold-gauze handkerchiefs braided in with brilliants, and chains of gold and pearls twisted over their hands; its wine-cellars of Poydras before which young dandies from nearby Charles Street, wearing short over-jackets capewise with the sleeves knotted under one arm, and flourishing elegant canes which concealed their nasty rapiers, lolled lazily and sipped wine and flicked pieces of silver to quadroons.

A distinctive city, New Orleans was more Southern in a broad sense than American. The attitude of its sensitive, punctilious aristocracy towards the breezy, rude, patronizing Westerners who floated down to the city on their flatboats, was that of the Roman patricians towards the invading barbarians. And the Westerners' new nationalism was incomprehensible to them: liberty was the principle for which men sacrificed their lives; a government and a flag were something else. So, if they cried "à bas les Espagnols!" and mourned the death of Napoleon and the assassination of the young Duke de Berri and celebrated the French victories in Spain,

it meant nothing more than that they were French in spirit though loyal to the Union to which they belonged.

Land, always more land, was what these pioneers were forever seeking. For what? Land ownership meant use. Even the Indians had understood that. Why fence it up like the English? Surely that was not democracy! And they knew about liberty and democracy, these proud New Orleans aristocrats. Had not La Frénière demanded the rights of the common people even before Patrick Henry began thundering for them? Had not Jefferson drawn all his political philosophy from the French font? Jefferson at least had understood these people when he purchased Louisiana, and had insisted upon one government for the territory – divided, according to Cherronesus (the famous physiographic division of ancient Greece) into Sylvania, Michigania, Assenisipia, Polypotamia (many waters), Metropotamia (mother of waters), and Saratoga; and in accepting the country had declared that the Louisianians would be admitted to all the rights, advantages and immunities of citizens of the United States. But Dr. Eustis, the Congressman from Massachusetts, had declared this to be a scrap of paper. "I am one of those who believe that the principles of liberty cannot be granted suddenly to a people accustomed to a regimen of a directly opposite hue. I consider them as standing in the same relation as if they were a conquered country." So Louisiana was slashed at will into opposing sections, its citizens forbidden to import slaves, an appointive executive, judiciary and law-making body presented with twenty-one acts to pass at their first session. Like the Indians, these superior Louisianians were to be denied self-rule by a nation of stock-jobbers and proletarians that had no conception of democracy except as a catch-word. . .

A YOUNG man from the Northwest visiting New Orleans on Denton Orfutt's flatboat looked with silent disfavour upon

the beautiful old city until he came to the slave-mart. Then he spoke to a companion. "If I ever get a chance," he said, "I will hit *that* hard!"

The young man was Abraham Lincoln, a native poor-white Southerner of Scotch-Irish extraction.

III. THE KINGDOM

National Democracy [1840-1848]

The Revolution of 1840

Calhoun, Clay and Benton

As for the just and noble idea – that nations, as well as individuals, are parts of one wondrous whole – it has hardly passed the lips or pen of any but religious men and poets.

H. Martineau.

I

THE revolution for national democracy, first given popular form by Jackson, was proceeding swiftly under economic pressure to the practical stage into which an idea that has taken possession of the masses resolves itself. The first steamship had made its appearance in the Pacific. In Savannah, Georgia, the *Chatham* and *Lamar* had been built of iron brought from England, the first metal ships to be constructed; and another, built of American iron, was projected. The *Great Western* and the *Sirius*, using only steam, crossed from Liverpool to New York, establishing the first regular steam service across the Atlantic. South Carolina erected a State railway; Pennsylvania built narrow-gauge tracks to keep New York from connecting with Pittsburgh, but the next year found trains running on a single track, the monopoly thus created being considered "necessary." Harden, a handyman of Boston, started carrying packages for fees, inaugurating the express service. Daguerre succeeded in perfecting a device for reproducing likenesses. Mississippi granted married women control of their property, a radical venture that shocked the rest of the country. A fourteen-volume edition of standard foreign literature was published and extensively circulated in the North and Middle West. The Capitol building had been practically completed after the original plans of Dr. Thornton.

And yet . . . in a land where there was no limit to natural resources and native genius the people were unemployed, starving and desperate. A depression without counterpart in the previous history of the country was on. With credit

impaired, money became dearer. Interest as high as twenty-four per cent. was not uncommon. The effect of Jackson's Specie Circular was too severe a strain on the East for the benefit of the West, and in May by common consent the banks began to suspend specie payments, then to fail. The Bank of New York cracked. Values began to melt. There was wholesale defalcation by land officials (sixty-four out of a total of sixty-seven), by bank officers, by the States themselves. Customs officials fled their posts. North Carolina farms sold for two per cent. of their value. In Mississippi a fifteen-hundred dollar slave could be bought for two hundred dollars. In Alabama practically all property changed hands. New York City was dead, shipping at a standstill. Workers were unemployed, and unions, which in ten years had grown to the strength of three hundred thousand, were disrupted—a condition that not even the Supreme Court had been able to effect. Only to the West had the ill winds been tempered into performing some indirect good—the acceleration of emigration.

What was wrong? With the Promised Land in sight the people still groped in the Wilderness. Surely the Jacksonian Era had been a millennium and Old Hickory a messiah; but for the Wilderness a Moses was needed!

Caught in the backwash, President Van Buren began to lose popularity all at once. But he managed to keep a level head amid the siege for various relief projects. A ten-hour day for government employees was passed. United States Treasury notes were issued to tide over the crisis. The question arose as to what to do with the moneys received by the Government, and Van Buren, resting at his favourite summer President's Palace at the White Sulphur Springs, thought out the idea of an independent Government treasury with vaults at Washington and at other important points where the public funds could be received and paid out; but this excellent plan was shuttled by partisan politics to almost the end of his administration.

The Whig-Republicans – as the nationalists were now calling themselves – were quick to take advantage of the discontent and emotional reaction. But now they realized that the time had come to hide the monarchical, or centralizing, designs of their party behind a screen of democracy. This would, moreover, serve the subtle end of helping discredit colonial revolutionary democracy – which the industrialists feared most of all – by making it blatantly ridiculous.

So . . . surely there was nothing wrong with democracy, they declared. Why, demokratia *was* the people; to say that demokratia was wrong was to say that the People were wrong! The fault lay in the usurpation of that glorious term by the Democratic Party, a hotbed of Toryism and corruption under the leadership of the demagogue Van Buren. The South democratic? Why, it was an aristocracy of the most oligarchic sort, deceiving the people with glittering generalities. Democracy meant one thing: equality.

In the State of New York the Whig-Republicans had already triumphed in the election of the thirty-nine-year-old William Henry Seward as Governor (though the Protestant clergy grumbled considerably because of his proposal to admit Roman Catholics to the public schools). Henry Clay was the ablest prospect for the Presidency; but he was personally unpopular, or rather, an able enough man to have made many enemies. Massachusetts nominated Webster, now home from his European tour; but it was obvious that the rest of the country did not quite trust that clever opportunist. The Whig-Republican Convention meeting in Harrisburg therefore decided that the hero of Tippecanoe, William Henry Harrison, an honest, sincere, nondescript old general of sixty-eight, was the likeliest candidate for the naive reason that he was not well enough known to be universally disliked. "The nomination of Harrison . . . was the triumph of Anti-Masonry and was entirely the work of W. H. Seward, the present Governor of New York," Adams noted in his *Diary*.

John Tyler, an old-fashioned Virginia Whig, was put on

the ticket to attract Southern votes. The Whigs were of course unable, as a pragmatic party, to write a platform, relying on Clay, their self-constituted leader, to dominate the administration and force the restoration of the national bank and a higher tariff. Speaking at Hanover, Vermont, Clay perfectly expressed his party's negative function: "The *fact* of General Harrison's election alone, without reference to the measures of the administration, will . . . bring assurance of the cessation of that long series of disastrous experiments which have so greatly affected the people. Confidence will immediately revive, credit will be restored, active business will return, and the prices of produce will rise." Alluding to Harrison's failure to make an address, Burnell of Massachusetts declared: "There was no need of an address. If the voice of the West, rolling down from the mountains and along the valleys, be not better than all the addresses that were ever uttered, then indeed a miracle has been wrought!"

Many prominent Southerners—such as Alexander H. Stephens and Robert Toombs of Georgia—supported the Whig candidate through class sympathy and a general desire for stability, thinking that the force of sectional cohesion might be diminished by keeping the parties national and avoiding the question of slavery. But the great majority, among them Calhoun, realizing that sectional cohesion was inevitable in any case, and relying on the non-interference policy of the Democratic Party in the protection of private interests, threw their support to Van Buren when the Democratic Party met at Baltimore and reiterated the policies of Jefferson and Jackson and renominated the Little Magician. Calhoun had no illusions about Van Buren as a suave and imperturbable careerist; but he knew the President was a true conservative who understood the meaning of property and a fixed social order, and he believed him to be as honest and kindly as was possible for a man in his position. Moreover, to conciliate Van Buren now might be the means of winning for himself (Calhoun) the support of the Northwest. Taking all things

into consideration, and particularly the fact that nationalism as a principle was far more dangerous than any political figure, Calhoun forgave both Jackson and Van Buren for their shabby treatment of him and joined Benton in vigorously supporting the Democratic candidate. (Ironically enough it was Jackson and Van Buren who had done most to establish popular democracy by which the nationalists were now profiting; and in a few years the presumably conservative Van Buren was to find himself in his true radical role in leading an assault on Southern property interests.) No Vice-President was nominated; and when the Whig-Republicans jeered, the Democrats retorted that if they could not agree on a man at least they could on principle. . .

More ironic still was the fact that General Harrison was much more of an aristocrat than the ambitious little "Uriah Heep" of Kinderhook, N. Y. Of a moderately wealthy and prominent family – his father had been Governor of Virginia and speaker at the Continental Congress – Harrison had himself had a distinguished career in the army and diplomatic service; and only his taste for open spaces and simple habits had led him to remove to Ohio and settle down in a log cabin. But in the abusive campaign typical of the time, a Baltimore newspaper unwisely saw fit to declare that "with two thousand dollars a year Harrison would be content to live in a log cabin and drink hard cider." The slur provided the Whig-Republicans with just the slogan they needed. Certainly *their* candidate would be content to live in a log cabin – that symbol of American hardihood! – and drink hard cider – that plain beverage of the common people! Leave it for aristocrats like Van Buren to sit on stuffed chairs and eat from golden spoons and dress in front of French mirrors!

The campaign of buncombe and nonsense started early in the year (1840). "The class of inducements addressed to the passions and imaginations of the people were such as to make history blush," said Benton. Badges, magazines, almanacs,

song-books and pictures were profusely distributed. Every village-green in the North and Middle West had its log-cabin headquarters, with puncheon floor, mud-smeared sides, latch-string, well-greased paper window, coon-skins drying outside, all complete. Cabins mounted on wheels were driven from town to town, and speakers wearing coon-skin caps harangued the crowds about the "Honesty of Plain Men" who yelled and sang themselves hoarse.

In a cabin made of logs, by a riverside,
There an honest farmer lives, free from sloth and pride.
To a gorgeous palace turn and his rival see
In his robes of regal state, tinselled finery.

See the farmer to his meal joyfully repair;
Crockery, cheese, and cider too—a hard but homely fare.

Martin to his breakfast comes at the hour of noon,
Sipping from a china cup with a golden spoon.

Martin's steeds impatient wait at the Palace door,
Outriders behind the coach and lackeys on before!

In Columbus and Dayton, Ohio, monstrous picnics were organized as political gatherings; at the latter place the crowds ran to a hundred thousand, and their camp occupied ten acres. Twenty thousand assembled on the Tippecanoe battleground for a three-day orgy, a remarkable demonstration of enthusiasm in view of the fact that there were no railroads in the locality. A great ball twelve feet in diameter was rolled from State to State, bearing the doggerel:

With heart and soul
This ball to roll;
May times improve
As on we move!

In Utica, N. Y., there was a great procession nine miles long. One car drawn by six horses carried a boy seated on a throne, dressed like King George in purple velvet and fine linen, one hand grasping a large golden key (to the

national treasury) hanging from a diamond chain around his neck, and the other a splendid sword like that used by knights of old. Immediately behind, for contrast, was an impersonation of Old Tip by the side of his log cabin with flail in hand, the other hand outstretched to some worn-out soldiers—the picture of benignity and simplicity. *Van, Van is a used-up man! Tippecanoe and Tyler Too! Down with Van Burenism! Oh, Typ and Ty!* screamed the crowds. Any attempt to reason with them was met with bursts of song.

The American Temperance Union may have frowned at the mention of cider, but they gave the new party their support. The New York *Courier and Enquirer* entered the campaign with zest. A small man from Maine with a club foot and dark magnetic eyes, S. S. Prentiss, "swung round the circle" for the first time in political history to make campaign speeches. The ballyhoo was even echoed in the halls of Congress. "Yes, sir," declared Charles Ogle, "Martin Van Buren has spent more than seventy dollars for each and every minute he has spent in the presidential office! How often has the clock ticked since that fatal hour? . . . The people's hard dollars were going at the rate of seventy a minute while he was dancing with the Countess of Westmoreland at Saratoga. That was dancing to a pretty dear tune—but the people paid the piper!"

Even the courtly Webster was enjoying himself. At Saratoga he regretted that he had not been born in a log cabin (though his father had) in order that he might have the incentive to provide his own children with something better—a dubious compliment which passed unnoticed in the general hysteria. At New York he shouted: "The man who says I am an aristocrat is a liar!" This was greeted with tumultuous applause. At Richmond, Virginia, he excelled himself: "There is one perpetual outcry in all the administration papers from Baltimore south admonishing the people of the South that their State governments and the property they hold in them are not secure if they admit a Northern man to any

considerable share in the administration of the government. Well—" his great voice soared like a trumpet—"well, I do repeat—proclaim it on the wings of the winds—tell it to all your friends—(cries from the audience, "We will! We will!")—tell it, I say, that standing here in the Capital of Virginia, beneath an October sun, in the midst of this assemblage, before the entire country, and upon all the responsibility which belongs to me, I say that there is no power directly or indirectly in Congress or the general Government to interfere in the slightest degree with the institutions of the South! (Cheering. A voice in the crowd: "That means two thousand more votes for Harrison!") And now I ask you to do me one favour. Carry that paper home. Read it, read it to your neighbours; and when you hear the question, 'Shall Daniel Webster profane the soil of Virginia?'—refute it!" In a choking voice, with tears coursing down his cheeks, Webster ended his oration. "We scorn the abuse of you! Welcome, Daniel Webster! Heaven bless you, Daniel Webster!" cried the crowd . . . who nevertheless never had and never would cast a vote for the great Vermonter.

But slavery was not so easily avoided, and Harrison himself was drawn into the discussion by the charge of being an Abolitionist—a charge he indignantly denied as a foul slander. As Governor of the Indiana Territory he had aided the Virginia party in suspending the operations of the Ordinance of 1787 prohibiting slavery in the Northwest Territory; as a member of Congress from Ohio he had voted for the admission of Missouri as a slave State; and now as a presidential candidate he publicly rebuked those meddlers who presumed to give "lectures upon morals and wisdom to States whose affairs have been so recently directed by Jefferson and Madison, Macon and Crawford." Abolitionism, he indicated, should be frowned upon, as well as any specific movement to prohibit slavery in the District of Columbia—a warning he was to repeat later in his inaugural. . .

One million more votes were cast in 1840 than in 1836.

Harrison received two hundred and thirty-four electoral votes to Van Buren's sixty.

General Harrison, as befitted the hero of Tippecanoe, had a magnificent procession at his inauguration. Promptly at eleven o'clock the retiring President and his successor left the President's House riding together the length of Pennsylvania Avenue, their women following in a second carriage. Arrived at the Capitol, they went into the President's room just off the Senate Chamber where Van Buren signed the left-over bills; and at noon (the clock being set back in case of delay) the party proceeded to the Senate Chamber where the House and Senate, the Supreme Court in their robes, foreign envoys and representatives, and special guests (George Washington Custis, who had been present at every inauguration since his illustrious grandfather's; Horace Greeley, the brilliant young journalist from New York; and others) were assembled. Here the Vice-President was sworn in. The party then proceeded to the East Portico where, in full view of the populace, the Chief Justice presented the Bible and administered the oath: "William Henry Harrison, do you solemnly swear you will faithfully execute the office of the President of the United States, and will to the best of your ability preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, so help you God?" "I do," answered the old soldier; and the new President then proceeded with his address in which he warned against the agitation of slavery. Escorted by mounted officers, militia from Baltimore and Philadelphia, and a company of marines – the first ever to take part in such a procession – President Harrison rode a white charger back to the President's House, saluting with deep bows the ladies who waved their handkerchiefs at him. Log cabins on wheels were drawn by the Tippecanoe Political Clubs of Maryland and Virginia. The Jesuit students at Georgetown came in a body carrying a banner. There was even a mounted loom with operators at work, upholding labour's part in the inauguration. . .

THUS ended the third great political revolution which completely reversed the democracy of the first revolution under Jefferson wherein the aristocracy led the people against financial and manufacturing absolutism in government. Clay, who had turned the backwoods men against their hero Jackson with the latter's own methods and written *Failure* to his administration, had been the first of his party to realize that industrialism must hide its absolutism with a pretended democracy if it was to induce the people to revolt for the wrong as well as the right principles, for material advantages as well as abstract liberty; and by this sham he became actually the builder of the system for which Alexander Hamilton had drawn the architectural plans. If democracy under Jackson had been Spartan, now it was a spree. Jackson's *demos krateo* had at least exposed the fallacy of a democratic head; the new nationalist democracy had too many heads to expose. Such rampant individualism created a horde of kings of finance; and since sovereigns cannot enforce the law against themselves, there was no need for law. Hyper-democracy and rugged individualism were so confused that the people could no longer differentiate between the triumph of the one and the power of the other.

Calhoun and his Democratic colleagues were worried. The democracy of the Whig-Republicans, wherein excellence was ridiculed, was not their democracy; but to prove popular democracy a delusion meant taking refuge in an imperious assertion of authority, and to attack the connotation of the word meant (to the people) an attack on the word itself. Must the warring ideals of democracy and excellence which the South had so painstakingly reconciled to produce a workable system, now be separated to work their hostile ways independently in darkness? The outstanding practical talent of the Whig-Republicans was that for organizing and disciplining and giving continuity and consistency to their efforts; and applied to politics that meant transforming the state into a mere business. Truly the nationalists had found a handy

bag of tricks labelled *Sound American Traditions of the Great Middle Class* from which they had extracted a first dazzling one, *Democracy*, to confuse the people. Other tricks, *Freedom* and *Union*, were being held in reserve for future fluke comebacks. . .

In England the nineteen-year-old Alexandrina Victoria, niece of William IV and daughter of the Duke of Kent, was ascending the Throne . . . to find Canada in revolt, Ireland in agitation, England discontented, parties exasperated, and disorders aggravated by the movements of the Repeal Associations of O'Connell. Italy was a volcano ready to erupt at any time with incipient revolutions. Poland was a constant source of victims for the gallows and for Siberia. In Austria-Hungary and the German States the sonorous echo of the French Revolution was rumbling. In Spain, Don Carlos was inciting the citizens against Maria Isabella. In France, Louis Philippe was busily suppressing insurrections in the vain hope of stemming the tide of modern revolutionary socialism.

A symbol of the times was the death of Talleyrand, last colourful representative of cool, aristocratic, Eighteenth Century cosmopolitanism; sole survivor of Enlightenment in an age of romantic, liberal and drab nationalism. To him nations had hardly existed: dynasties were the agencies of cosmopolitanism which ignored frontiers, and the agents of that peace which he believed the common people desired and needed above slavish freedom. Always loyal to France politically, yet he reserved an inner loyalty for Europe when the latter's permanent cultural interests were imperilled. If his fidelity was "a matter of dates" in deserting weak rulers, if he lied and cheated for France, that was because his craft was more intelligent and humane than blundering liberalism and brutality. If he took money for his services he was never bought, for he frankly named his price and always refunded if unsuccessful. The Prince of Benevant was *The Prince* of Machiavelli's own pattern whose "faith unfaithful kept him

falsely true," to whom patriotism was the perpetual expression of the patriot's duty. The renegade Bishop of Autun was an indolent, luxury-loving aristocrat who scathingly rebuked scepticism as a middle-class sham. The father of the Countess of Flahaut's son could believe in celibacy as a prohibition and yet gaze upon the reality of the blue eyes and massed hair of Madame Grande and Aimée de Coigny. At the last when he made his peace with the Church he held out his hands, palms down, for, "Don't forget I am a bishop," he murmured.

Prince Metternich, now sixty-five, still lived on, ruling Austria and dominating Europe; but that was only just since conservatism (which he incarnated) could readily blend with the new industrial liberalism steadily advancing, whereas the ideas of Talleyrand, who had experienced revolution and understood liberty, were not such as could mix with the new nationalist order. In the Vaults of the Dead, however, each would have his fitting epitaph: *Talleyrand, who served a reality, France!* and *Metternich, the agent of a ramshackle empire!*

II

THE democratic masquerade of the Whig-Republicans was to end sooner—and more tragically—than they had anticipated. General Harrison, who at heart was really a democrat (probably because he had *not* been born in a log cabin) and had merely lent himself to the machinations of his party mostly out of ambition and partly out of insensibility, promptly put himself at the disposal of "the people," and his supporters flocked to Washington seeking office as they had done after Jackson's inauguration, some of them even sleeping in corners of the White House so that they might be the first in the morning to greet the President. Due to over-exertion and exposure the old man caught a severe cold, and on April 3, just one month after his inauguration, he died of penumonia. John Tyler (the first Vice-President in American history to become the chief executive) automatically succeeded him;

and so after all their effort the Whig-Republicans had a Virginia Whig on their hands.

Immediately the new President came into conflict with his party. In May when Clay, the self-appointed dictator of the Harrison régime, appeared with an elaborate plan of legislation, Tyler readily assented to the repeal of the Van Buren Independent Treasury Act and the passage of a new tariff which considerably increased the duties levied under the compromise act of 1833, and to the Pre-emption Act which adjusted the worst evils of the land situation; but it was his persistent veto of all acts looking to the restoration of the bank that led to the storm.

Tyler was undoubtedly sensitive and somewhat vain, and probably tactless in showing his resentment at the dictatorialness of Clay; but there was no consistency in the Whig-Republicans' clamour about his disloyalty to their platform. In the first place they had never dared to publish a platform; and in the second, he was an old-fashioned Whig of known States' rights views, while his party sought merely to give the strict-constructionist views recognition without power. Tyler had resented the Democratic Party chiefly because of Jackson, and yet he had supported the latter in his vetoes of the bank and internal improvements; had cast the only vote in the Senate against the "Force Bill"; favoured the admission of Missouri as a slave-State, and the right of slave-holders to take their property into the territories. Moreover, he had expressed his views plainly in the campaign, and had done so with the approval of his party which had put him on the ticket for the purpose of attracting Southern votes; so that now in maintaining these principles he showed consistency, integrity and courage.

Tyler and his supporters – the old-fashioned Southern Whigs and the Democrats who, as the next congressional election showed, still had a power at least equal to that of the industrialists – agreed that individual activity should be allowed to accomplish whatever it could, and that thus far

individual freedom, not supervision, was the proper check. But individuals were and should be held accountable for their acts and duly punished for their transgressions. Thus admitting the selfishness and greediness of men and the weakness of public officials, individual freedom could not become a menace, for in a democracy men could exploit their fellows only through controlling monopolies and combines. Beyond the scope of individual activity or the promotion of private enterprise, incorporation laws must be resorted to as the only means of freeing business from politics; but since corporations were in essence democratic in that all the people took part in the enterprises – banking, insurance, bridges, turnpikes, railroads, canals, wharves, manufacturing, charting, and the promotion of general agriculture and the arts – such charters ought to be granted by the States under constitutional provisions, making them practically State-controlled. They should also be limited, with the right of repeal or limitation reserved, but also with limited liability; and the privileges should be made equal under laws applicable to all, and the people encouraged *not* to put too much faith (money) in them.

To Clay, a vital and instinctive man of his times and environment, this was not at all satisfactory. Unwilling to admit, however, that what his party stood for was the unrestrained individualism of acquisitive men who, protected by incorporation, assumed no personal responsibility in their piracy, he put the whole matter on a sentimental basis: that *restraint* reflected upon the native honesty, dignity and divinity of man. Once it was established that the *Union* was the sacred object of all true patriotism and loyalty, it would logically follow that the central Government was the valid source of all incorporation laws and tariffs. However, opposing this progressive view was the lingering stubborn tradition, which only an unusual cataclysm could dissipate, that a federal government was a democratic category evolved from the sovereignty of the people and so designed as to circumvent

the caprices and inequalities of a monarchistic power (whether dynastic or financial), so that in the meantime the Whig-Republicans must be content with a modicum of power to use the central Government for exploiting the people – or, in other words, a strong national bank which went a far way towards enabling the commercialists to control the machinery of the government.

The solution of the question was the peculiar contribution of a generation that refused to discuss the question collectively or to act nationally; and yet by that paradoxical muddling which leads men "by indirections to find directions," it was Tyler's insistence upon the Jacksonian precept of separating all business – including banks – from general politics that brought forward an ever greater opportunity for their merger: the incorporation laws, the only means of accomplishing that separation, which provided protection for unchecked individualism and greed, and by raising the question of who should grant charters, advanced the necessity for a central agency which in turn could be the more easily controlled for monopoly with its special privileges and mortmain. Nevertheless, at the time Tyler's vetoes of the bill to recharter the Bank were insulting to everything the nationalists stood for, and he was burned in effigy and a party-caucus read him out of the "Whig Party." "All political connections between this Party and John Tyler is at an end." . .

During the discussion of the bill Clay, who realized it was doomed, behaved like a petulant child that balks at play because it cannot make the rules, and attempted to make the proceedings of the august body to which he belonged a joke – he would have nursed a circus midget on his lap had one been available. Called to a point of order by Calhoun, he ridiculed Jefferson's *Manual* which he declared was compiled from Hatsell d'Ewes and others and had no significance to him whose own feelings were paramount to parliamentary procedure; and when Calhoun reminded him he had just

demanded that a bill be laid on the table by the same rules, he merely laughed. Again he waxed tearfully sentimental about the House (where the bank bill had been passed), referring to their act as "water from the cooling springs of patriotism," and invoking God's blessing upon them; whereupon Raynor of North Carolina objected vigorously to identifying the bank bill with the Almighty, Whose mind, he contended, was as well known by one as another. At other times Clay was malicious, as when he intimated Tyler should resign for the good of the country. Buchanan of Pennsylvania answered him: "The Senator from Kentucky tells us he never said that the President ought to have resigned, but only that resignation was one of the alternatives before him. A President resign! No President will ever think of doing such a thing. In the whole length of history I recollect but two memorable instances of this kind. One was that of the Roman Emperor Diocletian, and the other of the Emperor Charles V. The Roman, you know, went to raising cabbages as Mr. Van Buren is now doing; and Charles buried himself before he was dead – a fit emblem of the condition of a President who might resign his office in order that he might suffer a bill for *any fiscal bank* to become a law!"

Clay rose and pretended to defend the President against the charge of treason in having deserted his own party and lent himself to the Democrats. "It is a moral impossibility that there could ever exist so infamous, so unnatural, a union as that between a President who has bettered one party and the other party directly opposed to him, who must have too much regard for their character and the opinion of mankind to receive and impress him, if it were possible that he could prove false and faithless to his friends."

He went on to draw a word-caricature of the scene that probably occurred at the White House on the night the veto was agreed upon by the "whole Loco-Foco Party in Congress," as he designated the coalition of loyal Whigs and Democrats. "There stood the grave and distinguished Sena-

tor from South Carolina, tall, careworn, with furrowed brow, haggard and intensely gazing" – Calhoun called him to order but Clay ignored the interruption – "looking as if he were dissecting the last and newest abstraction which sprang from metaphysician's brain, and muttering to himself in half-uttered sounds: 'This is indeed a crisis!'"

After the laughter had subsided Clay went on: "There was the Senator from Alabama (King) standing upright and graceful as if he were ready to settle in the most authoritative manner any question of order or of etiquette that might possibly arise between the high assembled parties from Arkansas and Missouri (Servier and Benton), the latter looking at the Senator from South Carolina with an indignant curl on his lips and scorn in his eye, and pointing his finger with contempt, saying, 'He calls himself a statesman! Why, he has never produced even a decent humbug!' Nearby stood the Senator from Georgia (Cuthbert) conning over in his mind on what point he should make the next attack upon the Senator from Kentucky. On an ottoman reclined the other Senator from Missouri (Linn), indulging, with pleasant smiles on his face, in pleasing meditation on the rise, growth and future power of the new Colony of Oregon. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Buchanan) congratulates the President on the veto rescuing the country from the Bank: 'Thank Your Excellency for having accomplished against your friends what our most strenuous exertions were unable to accomplish!'"

Almost the last spiteful act of Clay was a resolution in the Senate for a constitutional amendment to limit the veto power of the Executive; and this Calhoun attacked with such vigour that it was ultimately defeated. His speech was published and extensively circulated. Involving, as it did, the complex majority-and-minority relationships in a democracy, it was a question to which he had given much thought and study.

Clay's thesis was in effect that the popular majority was in control, and that Harrison's election had therefore settled the questions of the bank and the other Whig measures – a thesis

very much after Jackson's reasoning. The weakness of Clay's premise, however, lay in the fact that at each election the majority might reverse itself. As it was, the next Congressional election would have discredited the Whig measures; but Calhoun answered the contention at the time with his own reasoning.

Even the President, so he argued, is not elected by mere numbers, for in the electoral college of each State the number of her Senators is added to each one's ratio of population, with the result that a minority of seven and one-quarter millions may elect against a majority of over eight and one-half millions. And in the Senate, whose voice is essential in all legislation and in many other matters, numbers are entirely ignored and the smallest State is as powerful as the largest: here four millions can overrule twelve millions. The mere numerical argument would, too, be quite as conclusive against the Judiciary. Thus the Executive, Senate and Judiciary would all be swept away to leave the House the only remnant of the Government. Nor does the proof against the intention to confer power on a bare majority end here, for in amending, seven and one-half millions can adopt against the wishes of nearly eight and one-quarter million, while about one and one-third millions can defeat any proposal against the wishes of over fourteen millions. And in framing and adopting the Constitution, too, the case was the same. Two hundred and fifty thousand could have rejected the instrument and thereby defeat the wishes of nearly three and one-half millions.

Such results, he concluded, showed conclusively that our system was based on a quite different theory from that of the popular majority, and the truth is that each branch was intentionally constituted very differently from the other, so as to bring in various *concurrent majorities* and ensure the broadest support of the Government's measures.

The veto power of the President had, therefore, been designed primarily to enable him to defend the powers given him. Without the right to judge for himself and to assert

and protect his rights, there would be no effective division of powers. The veto was also given him in order to require that a larger popular basis should stand behind a law of which he might disapprove. In such a case, the vote in the House of members representing a constituency of over ten and one-half millions against five and one-third is necessary to the passage of a law. Nor is the executive, as is often said, the more formidable branch. If his power has greatly increased, the acts and omissions of Congress are responsible, for his powers are few and perfectly guarded and all but those expressly granted are subject to control by law. Thus, the veto was in reality a wise precaution to prevent the tendency to fall under the *control of a dominant interest acting by a mere numerical majority*, and this resolution (of Clay's) was a symptom of that tendency. One other attempt was recently made to force through a vast and alarming system of measures on the plea that they had been decided by the late presidential election, "thus attempting to substitute the will of a majority of the people, in the choice of a Chief Magistrate, as the legislative authority of the Union, in lieu of the beautiful and profound system established by the Constitution."

After practically ordering all the cabinet to do the same, Clay dramatically resigned from the Senate, declaring that the measure he was presenting was the "last" he should offer to that body before going into "permanent" retirement. A good reason for retiring was his resentment against Tyler, but the real reason was to perfect his plans for the presidential campaign of 1844. Nevertheless, his fine voice shook with emotion, and the ladies in the gallery wept audibly, lifting gauze veils from their small flat-crowned straw hats — the new style replacing the immense flaring brims — to wipe the tears from their eyes. All the cabinet members resigned except Secretary of State Webster who excused himself characteristically upon the grounds of patriotism, claiming that it was necessary to finish his negotiations with Lord Ashburton, one

of the Baring brothers who had had considerable business relations with American interests and with the national bank, whom the new British minister, Sir Robert Peel, had sent to Washington to settle such problems as the Maine and the Northwest boundary lines, the suppression of the slave traffic, and the annexation of Texas and other Southwest territory about which such ominous protests had been coming from London as to indicate war was not an improbability. But aside from this good reason for not resigning, Webster also had real reasons of his own. In the first place he did not propose to accord Clay the position of full leadership, as his own aspirations for the Presidency had by no means been discarded; and in the second place, Tyler had promised to send him to England provided the minister there, Edward Everett, could be induced to resign, and if this could be arranged and his negotiations for Texas, California and Oregon were successful, his chances of being elected President in 1844 were most favourable.

When the Ashburton Treaty effected by Webster came up for consideration Calhoun gave it his support, though he regretted that the Oregon dispute had not been included. In regard to the agreement to maintain a naval force on the African coast for the suppression of the slave trade being plied under cover of the American flag, he would have preferred to make no terms with Great Britain – Congress having already passed a law to prohibit the trade; America having agreed at Ghent to use her best endeavours to suppress it; and a later act of Congress having declared the trade to be piracy and authorizing the President to treat with other nations for its suppression – but five other powers had made agreements with Great Britain as to mutual right of search and visitation, so that unless the United States consented it would make her appear to be alone against the civilized world in its attempt to suppress this nefarious business. Calhoun's attitude required great courage and independence in view of the Southern feeling that had been aroused over the *Creole*

matter, an American domestic slaveship which, while *en voyage* to New Orleans, had been seized by the slaves who murdered the crew and put the ship into Nassau; whereupon the British authorities tried a few Negroes for murder and turned the others free, but refused to make any apologies or reparations, Webster being curiously lukewarm and indifferent about these particular American interests.

In the McLeod case, however, Calhoun was more outspoken in his disagreement with Secretary of State Webster. This case dated from the time of the Canadian rebellion when the American ship *Caroline*, engaged in lending aid to the insurrectionists, had been seized on Lake Erie by British authorities and destroyed, in the course of which an American had been killed. Now, many years later, one Alexander McLeod, a British subject, openly boasted in New York that it was he who had slain the American, whereupon he was promptly seized and imprisoned. McLeod then claimed he was not a murderer but had killed the American by order of a superior officer. The British Government demanded his release, and Webster expressed the opinion that a person performing an act of public duty could not be held personally responsible to the laws of a foreign country. The State of New York, however, refused to release McLeod until he had been duly acquitted, and Calhoun defended her stand. A year later Webster introduced his bill for further remedial justice in the district courts of the United States, authorizing the removal from the State courts to those of the United States of any case of persons acting under colour of foreign authority and affecting foreign relations. Again Calhoun spoke in opposition, contending that it was an innovation both on the law of nations and on our Constitution and proposed to snatch cases of grave wrong to the laws of a State from her grasp. Suppose, he asked cannily, a foreign emissary should be sent among us with a commission to tamper with our slaves on the ground that slavery was contrary to the law of nations? His case could then be removed to the United States Court; and

where then was the proof that the latter might not come in time to take the view of slavery held by the nation sending such emissary? Thus he defeated Webster's measure by exposing it as an anti-slavery device; but had he been able to look twenty-five years into the future he would have seen Lincoln and his cabinet honouring, in the Capitol itself, the English anti-slavery reformer Thompson. . .

CALHOUN had foreseen that the loss of the bank bill would ruin the Whig-Republicans and lead to the formation of a new cabinet; and it was probably at that time, when four of the portfolios were in the President's hands, that Tyler first offered the Secretaryship of State to him. (Webster had resigned on the completion of the treaty with England, and, Everett having refused to surrender the mission to England, had returned to private life.) Calhoun hesitated a long time. It was a tempting opportunity to recoup his political career, particularly as Tyler indicated he should have a *carte blanche* as to the cabinet. The two men were warm personal friends, and their political tenets differed less than they did from the popular radicalism of their respective parties. But to his mind there was some stigma attached to a Democrat becoming the Secretary of State in a Whig administration, and he finally refused the tempting offer. Moreover, like Clay he had greater plans for himself. Reports coming to him indicated that the South was slowly but surely uniting – the recent Methodist schism splitting the church into North and South on the question of slavery had given great moral impetus to the sectional division – and that the Southern party was rallying to him as its leader. Tyler was still looking to his native State, Virginia, for support, though it was quite obvious that neither of the two national parties would trust him, and that he was not strong enough to lead a third party. Van Buren had some support in Georgia where the unionist sentiment, always strong, favoured a compromise on "a Northern man with Southern sympathies."

In October R. K. Crallé, who later became Calhoun's confidential clerk and editor of his *Works*, wrote from Lynchburg: "At present you are regarded, without co-rival, as the leader of the republican [democratic] party of the South, and I trust you will not jeopard a distinction so well earned by any compromise whatever. The bank excitement is passing and must pass away. The myrmidons of Mr. Clay cannot keep it alive. The State bank interest is now almost universally opposed to the incorporation of a national institution, and the highest ground may be taken with safety. . . If Tyler withdraw, there cannot, in my opinion, be a doubt as to the true policy of the republican [democratic] party. They must place you in opposition to Clay whom the nationals are determined to run. I wish to see *that* contest!"

One year after Clay's resignation Calhoun likewise resigned from the Senate "forever" . . . to lay plans for the forthcoming election. The Whig Party now offered no opposition: there was no longer any doubt that the Democracy would come into power, and the only question was the proper attitude to the Whig remnants, and the only danger that of the Democratic Party becoming so large it must eventually split into sectional components. Calhoun reiterated the policy of watchful waiting he had advanced at the beginning of Tyler's administration: "to stand fast on our principles, propose but few measures, and to oppose or support the measures proposed by the Whigs or administration just as they accord with or oppose our principles and policy."

III

FRIENDS were urging Calhoun to return to the Senate when the explosion occurred on the deck of the *Princeton* early in 1844 which led to the death of Secretary of State Upshur. The occurrence was most inopportune to the plans of the administration which had fixed upon the annexation of Texas as a prime point in its policy, Upshur having had a treaty in

course of negotiation; and Tyler was so upset that he was inclined to burst into tears at the bare mention of appointing a successor to Upshur. His advisors, knowing how important it was to find someone to take up the thread of the treaty, fixed upon Calhoun; and Henry A. Wise by dubious methods finally persuaded Tyler to offer the portfolio to Calhoun. Even the Whigs urged Calhoun to accept the post which he finally agreed to do with some reluctance, not feeling "at liberty to decline under the circumstances"; but made it a condition that when the two pending negotiations (Texas and Oregon) were completed he should be at liberty to retire.

Although Calhoun desired annexation he was not what might be called ardent about it; and his basic policy was so to compromise all differences as to make the inevitable expansion the least objectionable to all the parties concerned. In his own mind he had long since reconciled expansion with democracy by the doctrine of States' rights: if the individual states or nations of the Union preserved their autonomy and self-determination, then obviously the confederacy they composed was a democracy; but wield them into one nation through a central government, and they composed an empire. Now that the latter policy was becoming more and more prevalent in the North and Northwest (even the Abolitionists were ceasing to demand disunion, realizing that nationalism would give them the legal power to attack slavery through the central Government), the expansion of the South into the Southwest was the best means of combating this heresy with such democracy as would inhere in the new States through the doctrine of States' rights.

As for Texas specifically, he realized this was the only territory thus far annexed to the United States with the expressed consent of its inhabitants. Had the population of Louisiana, Florida, or northern Maine ever been asked whether they wanted to join the Union? Texas, which had been a suppliant for ten years, had the best possible claim to membership in the Union—better even than North Carolina or

Rhode Island which had yielded a tardy and grudging consent to the Constitution. Now after a decade of wrangling the annexation of Texas – Calhoun scorned the casuistical justification of *re*-annexation – was a *fait accompli* awaiting only official notification of the election of Tyler's successor for passage in both Houses. He regarded it as certain that the boundary of Texas would be extended to the Rio Grande, and that additional territory to the west would be eventually acquired and a clear and fixed interpretation made of the Monroe Doctrine, hitherto only vaguely defined. Texas alone, as large as the German Empire, cut up in several States to add senators to the pro-slavery ranks, would assure Southern independence in the national councils for a long time to come. Indeed, in some quarters in the South optimism extended so far as absolute domination by the acquisition of Mexico, Nicaragua and Cuba, which, with Florida and the South, would make the Empire of the Golden Circle a reality; but this sentiment was by no means general, Georgia and South Carolina having eight years before denounced even the "Texas scheme."

Calhoun's basic plans, ramified by policies and expediencies varying with different times and conditions, were now pretty well crystallized: to praise the slave-holding system and suppress agitation against it; to promote expansion and Southern prosperity; to cement the South-Southwest alliance, and to frame a fresh draft of government by concurrent majorities; and it was with the idea of furthering this policy, as well as to place himself in the line of succession to the Presidency, that he had accepted the State portfolio – leaving himself at liberty to resign in case his nomination was suggested. And, as a matter of fact, there was no other policy now for the South. The Northwest was steadily gaining and the South decreasing in representation, Virginia having lost five representatives, South Carolina two, and North Carolina and Georgia having barely held their own; and party lines were fast disappearing, Northern Democrats now being pro-

tariff and anti-slavery men, and Southern Whigs being anti-tariff and pro-slavery. Reduced to its meat such a policy meant a Southern bloc based on slavery and expansion, and an appeal to the North to realize the dangers of Southern desperation and save the Union. But, as events at the time of the Mexican War were to prove, Calhoun was not willing to secure expansion at *any* price.

The simultaneous annexation of Texas and Oregon would have balanced the sectional power and satisfied the opposing factions, had the matter not been complicated by other questions. Mexico, already angered at American recognition of a rebel state, had openly threatened war if Texas was annexed; and a small group of anti-imperialists, led by Benton, opposed annexation on the ground that the time for it was in 1819 when the Spanish treaty had sacrificed the interests of the West, whereas now that Mexican independence was a *fait accompli* annexation would affront a friendly nation. But Benton was irritated chiefly because Tyler had sent only one commissioner to negotiate the point of boundary instead of having a conciliatory discussion, and moreover the point gave him an issue on which to oppose Calhoun. New England was opposing annexation wholly on account of slavery as an abstract principle without any regard for compromise through the acquisition of the free-territory of Oregon; but New England was after all but one creator-artery of the American heart. England had also declared she desired to see slavery abolished from Texas and from the world; but Calhoun had answered publicly (that all the world might understand) to Mr. Pakenham (who had communicated Lord Aberdeen's dispatch) hinting that while the British had a perfect right to regulate slavery in their empire, should they attempt to do so in the world, the world had a right to protect itself; and added that the abolition of slavery in Texas would seriously impinge on the domestic security of the adjacent States.

But in the case of Oregon, Calhoun took the part of the

"Party of Saints," as he designated the English. In the treaty with England the Americans had agreed on the forty-ninth parallel as the boundary line from the Lakes to the summit of the main ridge of the Rockies, and he felt that the same line should be extended to the Pacific instead of the fifty-four-forty boundary claimed by the American settlers. For this he was scathingly denounced by proponents of the "whole of Oregon," who accused him of undue haste in annexing the slave-territory of Texas and lukewarmness in regard to the free-territory of Oregon. But this was no new policy of Calhoun's, since two years before he had declared: "In the case of Texas it is essential to act at once on account of Europe; time is against us. In the case of Oregon, time is acting for us, and if we shall have the wisdom to trust its operation it will assert and maintain our right with resistless force without costing a cent of money or a drop of blood. There is often in the affairs of government more efficacy and wisdom in non-action than in action. All we need to effect our object in this case is 'a wise and masterly inactivity.' Our population is rolling over the shores of the Pacific with an impetus greater than we can realize . . . we should then be as much stronger there comparatively than Great Britain is now stronger than we are."

Calhoun was convinced that England would declare war should America attempt to occupy the territory to the fifty-four-forty line; but he was handicapped by the unexpected opposition to the forty-second line which Great Britain had suggested, though this was later amended by offering the forty-ninth line from the Rockies to the intersection with the northeast branch of the Columbia River.

President Tyler in his annual message had encouraged the imperialists by remarking that the United States had always claimed the territory between the forty-second and the fifty-four-forty lines. John Quincy Adams came out for the extreme claim, declaring he did not believe a war would ensue; while Webster evaded the issue by saying he did not

think the territory was worth fighting for. A convention of Western States demanded the higher boundary line, and rebuked the "avarice, pride and ambition of Great Britain." Senator Berrien of Georgia exclaimed: "The arrogance of Great Britain! For aught I know, sir, arrogance may be characteristic of the Anglo-Saxon." Yancey of Alabama stated: "We must be careful lest prosperity and success should blind us to consequences; lest in our pride we do not fall." Crittendon of Kentucky "pouted and fretted and strutted"; Allen of Ohio and Cass of Michigan joined the Northern Democratic press in bitter tirades against Great Britain and reproaches against those who would sacrifice the national honour. "There is no question of honour involved; only a question of boundary," said Calhoun. His position was, that in actions at law between individuals for the possession of land, the rule was that the plaintiff might recover on the strength of his *own* title, not the weakness of his adversary's. Did America have a better claim than Great Britain to the disputed territory? Both countries based their claims on alleged discoveries and settlement treaties with France, Spain and Russia. But—Great Britain was largely in possession. No doubt he remembered some twenty years before, at the beginning of his political career, when John Floyd of Virginia had introduced a bill in the House to effect a settlement on the Pacific Coast at the mouth of the Columbia River, urging as an incentive the profits to be derived from the whale fisheries and trade with India and China; but the House had rejected it since they were not sure that China was closer to America on the Pacific, and even if it was, the cost of land transportation would offset the saving in ocean travel; and that, moreover, a country so distant must sooner or later secede from the Union so there was no point in improving it. . .

THE presidential election was imminent, and still the necessary impetus to Calhoun's candidacy had not material-

ized. His leadership in his own State was now so assured that whenever he "took snuff all South Carolina sneezed." Calhoun *was* South Carolina. But South Carolina was not the South. Even if that had been the case, the South alone was not powerful enough to put forward a successful Southern party; and the nomination of Calhoun, now accepted as the incarnation of exclusively Southern doctrines, would have meant that. It was hard for him to acknowledge the truth, that the time was not yet ripe for his nomination, and abandon the cause which the South Carolina party had canvassed so loyally (since he had abandoned the broad "nationalistic" tenets on which his earlier aspirations for the Presidency were based this was the first time his hopes had been so acutely aroused); but there was compensating satisfaction in not having to obscure his stand on the tariff for the sake of obtaining the votes of protectionist States. Now he wanted only the endorsement of a united South.

If Calhoun's new consistency displayed inconsistency with past views and conduct, at the same time it portrayed the wisdom of a higher rule of grace; for from the time he declared he should be "more Southern," there was no possibility of his being misinterpreted or quoted by any group save his own; whereas Jefferson, remembered for his ideas and ideals, was already a vague figure of legend, quoted alike by irreconcilable groups to justify their doctrines. At the time Calhoun was probably the purest man in public life, and knew the workings of the American government better than any contemporary. A politician who hated politics, he looked upon them only as a means to an end; and if that end were ever achieved, he had sworn to apply the axe to the tree of patronage and affiliated corruption, and deal fairly and justly with the respective interests of the three great sections. Knowing the South's love of liberty and hatred of reform, he trusted his own section if let alone to leave others alone. Next to the South he trusted the West; so that if an alliance between two sections was necessary to secure a tolerant

majority power, that could be best secured by a South-West alliance. But Clay's efforts to unite the North and West (for his private advancement) by a disreputable tariff system was bearing fruit, and it was becoming obvious that the Northwest, though having little need for a high tariff on commodities they did not consume, was more and more regarding with favour a system that provided revenue for internal improvements and was supposed to procure higher price for its hides. In that case, the South must look forward to an alliance with the Southwest against the North and Northwest. . .

HENRY CLAY and Martin Van Buren were the likeliest candidates respectively of the Whig-Republican and the Democratic Parties; but when each of them sent a letter to his constituency advising against any discussion of the annexation questions during the campaign, the collusion was so obvious that a wave of popular indignation spread rapidly, the Texas and Oregon questions being the burning issues of the day and therefore of prime importance to the people. Clay's party, of mere pragmatic foundation, was the less disturbed. The *Unionist,* the *Evening Post,* and the *Clay Tribune* warmly defended his dissembling as true statesmanship. Seward declared in his last speech for Clay: "I desire to say that as I have spoken here I have everywhere spoken, not as an apologist for the Whig Party or its leaders, but as an advocate of the interests and honour of my country paramount to the interest of all partisans and all parties. . . Let others hereafter do what they may, I shall stand on the same ground I now occupy, always demanding the abolition of slavery in America by political argument and suffrage and by the constitutional action of all public authorities." Which of his mentors—Thurlow Weed or John Quincy Adams—was then speaking through Seward was not difficult to determine. . . Adams, emerging for the first time since he had disputed the gag rule eight years before, endorsed Clay and took occasion to speak his mind on annexation and slavery.

If the annexation of Texas was effected, the Confederation was ended. This was not said, however, because of slavery being there: slavery was embedded in the Constitution and should be allowed to die by the processes of peace rather than war. After saying which the old man turned to a project nearer his heart—the foundation of the Smithsonian Institute—and ignored the abuse which the Abolitionists heaped upon him. But the constant recurrence of the Abolitionists' reproach of the Whig Party for evading the slavery issue was significant: it showed that the new industrial party was expected to be anti-slavery.

The Democratic Party, incensed at Van Buren's duplicity, now met and condemned him to obscurity. Robert J. Walker, the little Senator from Mississippi, assumed control of the campaign; and with the slogan, *All of Texas, All of Oregon!* managed to unite the South and West in a coalition resembling that in 1828 under Jackson. Since most of the opposition to the exorbitant Oregon claims came from the South, it was apparent that the Northern and Western Democrats had control of the Party. Walker also shrewdly appealed to the North by suggesting the possibilities of commercial expansion in the Pacific. Tyler, who had abandoned his vain attempt to run on an independent ticket, finally gave his support to Walker's dark horse, James K. Polk, a native of North Carolina who had removed to Tennessee and been successively a member of the State Legislature, Speaker of the House, Governor of Tennessee, and candidate for the Presidency four years before when he had received one electoral vote. Polk, a man of fifty, was somewhat narrow and colourless in character, and of moderate intellect; but he was far from spineless, possessed an iron will and determination, and—was an avowed expansionist.

But now the anti-slavery elements presented a political force to be reckoned with. From a few disorganized fanatics they had grown into a disciplined political body. True, Elijah Lovejoy, an Illinois clergyman, had been murdered and

his Abolitionist printing-press destroyed; Prudence Crandall's Connecticut school for blacks had been menaced; William Lloyd Garrison had been attacked by a Boston mob; and William Ellery Channing had been deserted by most of his congregation because of his anti-slavery tracts. But these outbreaks were merely the last spurts of a dying conservatism in the North, while the reformers bore the torch of the fresh fire. These anti-slavery elements now assembled as the Liberty Party, and distrusting Henry Clay with his numerous slaves at *Ashlands*, and his two minds about the annexation of Texas, nominated Joseph G. Birney on an anti-annexation platform; while the Anti-Slavery Society of 1833, now with its hundreds of branches and a membership of a hundred and fifty thousand, adopted a straight abolition platform. A new party calling itself the Native American Party—later to be known as the Know-Nothing Party—came into existence demanding the repeal of the naturalization laws and the requirement of twenty-one years' residence before naturalization in order to prevent "foreigners" from holding office. Smaller political groups—the Butt-end Coon Hunters and the Subterraneans, the latter composed of New York City radicals led by Mike Walsh—also made their appearance.

The Democratic victory at the polls was, therefore, hardly a triumph, for it was now evident that the combined anti-slavery parties held the balance of power, and that their combination with the Whig-Republicans would put them in control of the country.

Meantime, the Democrats having espoused the cause of the downtrodden foreigner (though it cost them the control of Tammany Hall in New York and other Democratic organizations in Northern urban centers), their victory had aroused the nationalistic, in addition to the reforming, elements to a fury; and the tendency of materialists ever being to blame anything but the right thing for their defeat, these elements began to cry loudly that "the Irish have defeated Clay! The government that England governs, governs America!" A

bitter and unreasonable persecution of the Irish began, which permanently turned those unfortunate emigrants away from the Whig-Republican Party. Catholic churches and institutions were attacked. A mob of four thousand burned the Ursuline Convent at Charlestown, Massachusetts, driving the nuns into the street. Priests were not safe on the streets; suspects were tracked down and mistreated, and the civil authority offered them no redress. It was the old story of any Roman Catholic being a cleric, and therefore anyone who was anti-clerical must be anti-Roman Catholic. Moreover, it was alleged that since Roman Catholics accepted dogma in competition with science, Roman Catholics were opposed to *progress* and encouraged ignorance. About the same time the Mormon leader, Joseph Smith, was lynched in Illinois. He too had offended against middle-class moralism. . .

THREE days before he left office President Tyler signed the bill providing for the re-annexation of Texas and the extension of the line of the Missouri Compromise through the new territory. He and Calhoun at once hastened messengers to Texas, and ordered two regiments of troops under Colonel Zachary Taylor to take position at Corpus Christi on the southern bank of the Nueces River, and sent a squadron of the Navy under Commodore Connor to the mouth of the Rio Grande, to protect Texas in case of a Mexican invasion.

In April when final arrangements were made for carrying out the terms of the bill, President Polk was in office. To Calhoun's surprise Polk had blandly announced in his inaugural that he would proceed to "reoccupy Oregon" – that is, he would proceed to carry out the mandate of the Baltimore Democratic Convention even at the risk of a war with England!—whereas Calhoun had promised the British minister to compromise the two countries' claims, a moderate attitude that had possibly so far averted war. The minister to England, writing Calhoun about various policies, urged the Secretary of State to save the country despite the President; but

it was now quite apparent that Polk had no intention of retaining Calhoun in his Cabinet which was to be made up of the extreme imperialists whose eyes were fixed upon the Panama Canal and the Oriental trade. Moreover, Polk did not want strong and independent men, particularly one with a popular following, and he proposed to be his own head.

Probably Calhoun would have liked to remain in the Cabinet for a time. He had made the settlement of the Texas and Oregon questions the chief object of his office, and now that both had been brought to fruition he was disposed to finish the job; but he declined to compromise with the extremists, accepted his *congé* with good grace, refused a mission to England, and set out for his plantation at Fort Hill. Despite this disappointment, however, his hopes for the fulfillment of his great ambition were high. London was speaking of him as "the friend of peace"; the New York *Journal of Commerce* had hailed him as "the saviour of his country"; Polk had assured him that he would be the former's successor in 1848, and on his way home through Virginia the Governor had toasted him as "the next President." Four years was a long time for a man of sixty-two, and one in such delicate health, to wait; but the reward was a dazzling one with which to crown his political career. Postponement had done much to assure the fulfillment of his ambition, as the results of the past election had vindicated his belief that the time was not yet ripe for his nomination, Clay having received many Southern votes. But now, "this is the end of Clay," he told himself confidently.

At home during the spring Calhoun occupied himself with the affairs of his plantation and writing on his "enquiry into the elements of political science, preliminary to a treatise on the Constitution of the United States." But he was not the type of man that relished enforced leisure; and as his popularity in the South grew, his friends were constantly urging him to return to public life. Huger's resignation from the Senate having left a vacancy, Calhoun was readily prevailed

upon to fill it—with the promise of election to the Senate after the expiration of the term.

During the summer he journeyed by way of Alabama to preside over the Memphis Convention of the Mississippi Valley, arranged by Douglas of Illinois and men of the Northwest in conjunction with General Gadsen of South Carolina and Major Tait of Alabama, both railroad presidents. The trip, Calhoun wrote, was a triumphal progress. At Mobile he was met by a delegation from New Orleans which took him by special steamer to the latter city. At Vicksburg he was publicly welcomed by Jefferson Davis who was also keenly interested in Calhoun's project for uniting Charleston with Muscle Shoals by a railroad across Georgia, and thence, according to Hayne's project, through the Blue Ridge to Cincinnati, thus binding the South and West with the "mystical ties of commerce" that would be productive of common interests and understanding. With Congress making land grants to new railroads and the Postmaster General giving bonuses for carrying mail, railroads were rapidly expanding; and by linking the cotton-growing interests with those of the West, the old Jacksonian territory would again come into power, while at the same time slavery, by becoming identified with the new interests, would be more securely established. In his address, Calhoun urged the adoption of the convention's full program as to railroad construction, and declared that Congress had the constitutional power to improve the navigation of the Mississippi because that river was practically an "inland sea." This was virtually returning to the internal improvements he had denounced twelve years before; but as a matter of fact, if the federal Government was building harbours on the Gulf and the Atlantic, it was no less constitutional to do so at Louisville and Chicago. Calhoun, however, went much further in recommending that the federal Government make land grants directly to the railroads in the territories; provide free iron for construction (which would have meant a bonus of two thousand dollars a mile), and guar-

antee long-term mail contracts at rates far above the regular price. Whether his speech was delivered in an optimistic mood in regard to his expectations in the forthcoming presidential election, or whether he believed his ideas if fulfilled would redound to the advantage of the South, was not perfectly apparent to his followers; but so far as stimulating enthusiasm was concerned the convention was a fiasco, for Southerners had little aptitude for commerce, and by now the younger men were beginning to disparage the possibility of any permanent union with the West. Where the basic interests and social systems were so different, the most that could be accomplished was an agreement to live together by mutual concessions; but the younger men were even losing faith in the virtue of compromise.

IV

THE twenty-ninth Congress met on December 1, 1845, and Calhoun took his seat in the Senate three weeks later. In the meantime Polk had offered to assume all American claims against Mexico and buy New Mexico (including Arizona, Nevada and Utah) and California; but Mexico not only refused to sell but declined to receive Polk's representative, John Slidell. The dispute was ostensibly over the western boundary, the United States contending that the Rio Grande – the boundary when Texas was sold to Spain in 1800 – was the true line, whereas Mexico had assigned to Texas only the area she had had as one of the Mexican states. In order to forestall the American claim by armed possession, Polk ordered Taylor to cross the Nueces River and advance to the Rio Grande, and there halt unless the Mexicans first attacked him.

News of this having filtered out in Washington, Senator Clayton of Delaware appealed to Calhoun to "do something" to stop the inevitable conflict. "It cannot be! It is impossible!" exclaimed Calhoun. But when he was sure that this was exactly what Polk had done, he still declined to lead

the opposition and thus by incurring the President's hostility undermine his influence in the settlement of the Oregon question.

As was expected, the Mexicans promptly attacked Taylor; and while the ensuing battle was a mere skirmish, it justified Polk in ordering the Pacific naval commander to seize California immediately war was declared and in asking Congress to accept the issue that war existed by the act of Mexico.

Calhoun, repudiating the heresy of expansion at any price, now came forth as leader of the opposition and fought the bill energetically. Hostility might exist, he argued, but war could not exist except by the declaration of Congress. Mexico might ultimately disavow the act as that of an irresponsible general; at least she should be given an opportunity to do so. In the meantime, the United States should continue Tyler's (and his) policy of taking a defensive line to protect American interests against invasion only. All his constitutional views were shocked by the idea of a President creating a war. "It would be just as impossible for me to vote for that preamble," he cried, his eyes flashing in his thin, white face, "as to plunge a dagger in my heart!" He brought down his skeleton-like hand so forcefully upon the table in front of him that all the members looked up, startled, to see him trembling violently. This, they realized wonderingly, was no mere political ruse: here was a man deliberately sacrificing his career for what he held to be a principle. "He is like a great general who wins great battles and then throws away his life in a street fracas," a friend wrote. His enemies, however, searched their imagination to find an ulterior motive for his stand, and declared that his opposition to the war was because it would certainly postpone, and probably kill, his plans as expressed at Memphis to unite the South and West.

The bill passed, and in the meantime Taylor was advancing with his force of regulars in a forward movement against Pala Alta where on May 8 he won a great victory, to be followed in eight months by other victories at Resaca de las Palmas

and Buena Vista. No one bothered to speculate about the outcome of the war which was taken for granted. . .

As a sop to the anti-Texas North, Polk was proceeding as arrogantly in the settlement of the Oregon question. The joint-occupation treaty with Great Britain was denounced in Congress, and Douglas offered resolutions, stating that the title to the fifty-four-forty boundary line was *not* open to arbitration, which the House passed, at the same time authorizing the President to notify Great Britain of the abrogation of the joint-occupation treaty in the stated twelve months. Three weeks later Senator Hannegan of Indiana introduced further resolutions declaring that the abandonment of the claim to the higher line would mean the surrender of the honour, character and best interests of the American people. Calhoun opposed these resolutions, pointing out that the American Navy was no match for Great Britain's in the Pacific, and that the inaccessibility and roughness of the territory would make it impossible to rush troops there to protect American lives and interests. "If war should come it will be no common war; and while I shall give every support to my country, I shall hold those responsible by whose rashness it has been provoked." Precipitancy, he repeated, would lose Oregon forever to the United States—"no, not forever; but it will lose you Oregon in the first struggle, and then it will require another struggle hereafter to regain it."

Most of the Southern senators supported Calhoun while the Northern senators still held to the higher line. Joshua Giddings, the Abolitionist member from Ohio, embracing any opportunity to oppose Calhoun and the South, declared that the South feared a war with Great Britain because it would release a slave insurrection! "Servile insurrections torment their imaginations; rapine, blood and murder dance before their affrighted vision. They are now seen in every part of the hall calling on Whigs and Democrats to save them from the dreadful consequences of their own policy. Well, sir, I

reply to them, 'This is your own policy, not ours; you have forced us into it against our will; you have prepared the present chalice and we will press it to your lips until you swallow the very dregs!'"

Fortunately the Senate refused to adopt the House resolutions, and passed them in a modified form stating that the United States would like to settle the claims. The negotiations were proceeding satisfactorily between Secretary of State James Buchanan and Great Britain when the latter unexpectedly offered to compromise on the forty-ninth parallel as far as the channel separating Van Couver's Island from the mainland, and in June a treaty was signed. Polk side-stepped the issue by pretending to ask the Senate's "advice"; and when Benton assured him that the majority would be in their places to vote for the treaty, the President gracefully acquiesced, firing this private salvo to cover his retreat: "My opinions on the Oregon question were stated in my inaugural and they remain unchanged." Practically all the Southern senators voted for the treaty, while Hannegan and his squad roared with fury. The issue, like the Texas question, had helped further to cement the South and to disrupt the Democratic Party. . .

In August Congress was presented with a measure authorizing the President to buy from Mexico what he intended to take by force. A proviso, offered by the meek David Wilmot, representative of Pennsylvania, stated that no territory acquired by the United States by purchase or war should include slavery. President Polk regarded the rider as the inconsidered blunder of an unimportant member of Congress, and sent for Wilmot and persuaded him to recede from his position; but in the meantime the debate which it aroused had reached the precedented bitterness that any discussion of slavery now always provoked. Calhoun took the offensive; Benton, to injure Calhoun in the Northwest, supported the rider. Virginia declared she would go to war rather than

see the proviso a law. In Mississippi there were meetings of protest everywhere, and actual steps were taken towards secession.

In the North the effect was different but as untempered as in the South. Forgetting that Mexico had threatened and actually provoked the war, and remembering only their anti-slavery sentiments; ignoring the fact that Texas was now one of the States of the Union which the federal Government was bound to protect against foreign invasion, and thinking only of their determination to halt the extension of slavery; refusing to concede the bravery of the American troops who, numbering at the most about fifty thousand, were always greatly outnumbered in battle; in other words, putting their reforming opinions above every patriotic consideration, the Northern fanatics were shouting defiance at the South, the war, and the Government while the press and public sentiment increasingly supported them. The Boston *Courier* was publishing Lowell's *Biglow Papers*, the supposedly humorous and biting commentaries of a native rustic so dear to the provincial American heart. A House resolution, sponsored by Abraham Lincoln (who had helped annihilate the inoffensive Foxes), condemned the war as unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun. Seward, who had definitely espoused the "Higher Laws" than the Constitution and the law of the land, declared that no State should join the Union until it had first adopted the "System"—the system being as vague as the higher laws except in so far as slavery was concerned.

"It is understood that the North is united on the Wilmot Proviso to a man," declared Calhoun, "and intend to act on it when the country is conquered. If the South has any regard for their safety they will defeat it even if the Union be rent asunder. I love the Union and desire above all things to save the whole; but if that cannot be, to save the portion where Providence has cast my lot." He was beginning to realize now that his dream of uniting the South and West and preserving the Union was losing its substance, and that the only

thing to do was to return to the particularist views of his own State and unite the South against the common danger. Davis, Mason, Rhett, Lowndes and Yancey, being younger men, had already sensed this alternative, and were engaged in arousing the South.

"I concur entirely in the opinion you express that instead of shunning we ought to court the issue with the North on the slavery question," Calhoun wrote a member of the Alabama Legislature. "I would even go one step further and add that it is our duty – due to ourselves, to the Union, and our political institutions – to force the issue with the North. We are now stronger relatively than we shall be hereafter, politically and morally. Unless we bring on the issue, delay to us will be dangerous indeed. It (delay) is the policy of those who seek our destruction. . . Such has been my opinion from the first. Had the South, or even my own State, backed me, I would have forced the issue on the North in 1835 when the spirit of abolitionism first developed to any considerable extent. It is a true maxim to meet danger on the frontier, in politics as well as in war. Thus thinking, I am of the impression that if the South act as it ought, the Wilmot Proviso instead of proving to be the means of successfully assailing us and our peculiar institution may be made the occasion of successfully asserting our equality and rights by enabling us to force the issue on the North. Something of the kind is indispensable to arouse and unite the South. If we should not meet (the issue) as we ought, I greatly fear our doom will be fixed: it would prove that we either have not the sense or spirit to defend ourselves and our institution." Disunion, he thought, was an "extreme remedy and ought not to be resorted to until all others have failed and then only in defence of our liberty and safety. . . There is and can be but one remedy short of disunion, and that is to retaliate on our part by refusing to fulfill the stipulations in their favour or such as we may select . . . among these the right of their ships and commerce to enter and depart from our ports . . . that

the refusal on their part would justify us in refusing to fulfill on our part, is too clear to admit of argument. That it would be effectual in compelling them to fulfill those (stipulations) in our favour, can hardly be doubted when the immense profit they make by trade and navigation out of us is regarded; and also the advantages we would derive from the direct trade it would establish between the rest of the world and our ports."

Calhoun spoke on the bill on February 9, mostly in reference to the vigorous prosecution of the war (which he still opposed); but towards the end of his speech he mentioned the "deeper and more alarming problems" to be met in disposing of the acquired territory. The North was apparently united in the determination that they should have the exclusive benefit and monopoly in that region by virtue of laws to exclude slave-holders from migrating to it with their property; and he added prophetically, "Be assured if there be stern determination on one side to exclude us, there will be determination still sterner on ours not to be excluded."

The Wilmot rider at first failed to pass because of the curious fact that the clocks of the two Houses did not agree, the Senate not taking action until after the House had adjourned; and later it failed on vote. But the effect was significant. Calhoun had declared, "Mexico is the forbidden fruit; the penalty of eating of it will be political death!" The war had brought the Proviso; the Proviso had provoked the storm of anti-slavery sentiment that swept over the North.

Ten days later Calhoun followed up the points of his speech by offering a set of abstract resolutions asserting the joint ownership of the territories by the several States, and that Congress had no right to pass any law by which a State was deprived of its equal rights therein; and that the people forming a new constitution had the unconditional right to adopt the government they thought best for themselves, subject only to the constitutional provision that it should remain republican. Benton promptly denounced the resolutions as

"a string of abstractions," saying he would "never leave public business to take up firebrands to set the world on fire." A few days later he added: "As Sylla saw in the young Cæsar many Mariuses, so I see in them (the resolutions) many nullifications." Calhoun replied that all the great rules of life were abstractions, and that he had counted on finding the Senator from Missouri, the representative of a slave-holding State, and a native of his sister-State, North Carolina, ready to support the resolutions; whereupon Benton snapped, "I shall be found in the right place – on the side of my country and the Union."

Clay came out of his retirement at *Ashlands* to make an impassioned appeal to the country against the wickedness of despoiling a helpless neighbour. John Quincy Adams, at the end of his career and near death, continued to denounce both slavery and the war. Webster, still with an eye on the Presidency, was non-committal until he had completed his contemplated tour of the South and West to sound out the sentiment there. . .

CALHOUN, Clay and Benton were now in their old age, Clay being past seventy, the others four years younger. Rich in the wisdom of experience of their yesterdays, now they lacked the time necessary for the execution of new enterprises which were to them like the new young shoots on the gnarled trunk of old apple trees. Broadly speaking, all three were from the same stock – products of the old South – Benton having been born a North Carolinian and, after graduation at the State University, gone to Tennessee for his health where he served as State Senator before moving to Missouri; Clay having been born in Kentucky, though of a Virginia family. All three belonged to the upper class, Benton having been the son of the secretary to the last Royal Governor of North Carolina; Clay the son of an eminent Virginia clergyman who had removed to Kentucky. All three were gentlemen by the standards of the day, well educated in the classics and

in law, polished in manners and conversation; all successful men of the world who moved in good society. But it was in temperament that they differed most; and it is temperament, what might be called a different germ plasm, that determines how far men are swayed by the demands of their inner nature, how far by external circumstances. Placed in the same environment the three men would still have been at variance; in different environments they became the incarnations of such diverse doctrines as Southern slavocratic agrarianism, Northern mercantilism, and Western imperialism.

Calhoun, though hospitable and free and unreserved with all classes and devoid of aristocratic exclusiveness ("I always endeavour to make my residence agreeable," he wrote), was not what was called a good mixer, having few close friends, and never cultivating people because he needed them. Given to introspection, to seeking truth through reason, he relied on logic rather than appeal to the passions to inculcate his teachings; consequently his analyses and expositions failed to inspire his followers until long after the dramatic occasion. "My conclusions follow the premises as night to day, and therefore I cannot be wrong," he declared. "In looking back I see nothing to regret and little to correct." It was for others to accept and submit. "I hate a man who makes me think so much," wrote Prioleau. "For the last three hours I have been on a stretcher, trying to follow him (Calhoun) through heaven and earth. I feel weary with the effort, and I hate a man who makes me feel my own inferiority." Dixon H. Lewis of Alabama was somewhat of the same opinion: "Calhoun is my principal associate, but he is too intellectual, too industrious, too intent in the struggle of politics to suit me except as an occasional companion. There is no relaxation about him; on the contrary, when I seek to relax he screws me the higher in some sort of excitement." His concentration of vision and industry of purpose, characteristic of the artistic or philosophic temperament, was a mode

of limitation which to the average man seemed to be a lack of wholeness and completeness.

Though often accused of being a metaphysician, actually Calhoun was farthest from being so: he detested alike the "manifest destiny" belief in the vague and metaphysical power of a changing world, the doctrine of the inevitability of social forces, and the opportunistic policy of "muddling through" which took for granted the people as an unthinking mob. A realist, he saw the world being changed by men acting in their social, economic and political capacities; therefore statecraft, above all professions, required precision, and what he sought was the power of analysis and combination, or that power which reduced a complex idea into its components, traced causes to their first principles, and by generalization united the whole into a harmonious system. Far from deserving contempt, it was the highest power of the human mind—the power that raised man above the brute.

Politics being his vocation, he made it a principle to give the best of his mind to it, and consequently turned more and more to formulas rather than expediencies. The right explanation of his politics, therefore, was to be found as much in his temperament and character as in external circumstances. A realist, he detested poetry, transcendentalism and sentimental romanticism, and found his greatest intellectual relaxation in the Greek and Roman political writers and the Eighteenth Century philosophers such as Locke, Burke and Montesquieu. Those who could not make a distinction between scepticism and idealism thought him a sceptic; but for that he was too thoughtful and kind. Inclined to melancholy, he never jested or resorted to whimsicality; but he was always courteous—in a formal way which denoted sympathy and consideration—and patient. An aristocratic deist, his personal life was open and pure. "I hold the duties of life to be greater than life itself," he wrote, "and that in performing them manfully against hope our labour is not lost but will

be productive of good in after times. This life is a struggle against evil, and to him who acts on proper principle the reward is in the struggle more than in the victory. It is both that enhances it."

Calhoun was perhaps vain: like all men, he wished to have "the glory of having written well," just as those who read him wished to have the glory of having read well; but such vanity, which made him all nerve to the opinion of others, was not conceit which is satisfied with its opinion of itself. He had "only a poor voice," said H. S. Fulkerson, "which he has cultivated to make his utterances clear, strong, full and distinct; not musical, but pleasant." "He is the most elegant speaker that sits in the House," wrote J. C. Jewett. "His gestures are easy and graceful, his manner favourable, his language elegant. He confines himself closely to the subject which he always understands, and so enlightens everyone within hearing. Having said all that a statesman should say, he is done." Such was his vanity in seeking to hide his faults and defects, a vanity not unmixed with humility in acknowledging those defects, in contrast with that cruder conceit which is blind to self-imperfections.

Without class superiority, Calhoun was in spirit essentially an aristocrat; but he did not regard the aristocratic spirit as merely a matter of desire or virtue but principally of training. The secular virtues needed intelligent direction (as the Church had established customs and institutions favourable to the virtues it preached), for such virtues were in the heart, and any healthy organism needed other members. Hence, more than Benton and Clay, he believed the common people to be good and true, but in their simplicity and trust susceptible of being perverted by unscrupulous knaves for the latter's selfish ends; wherefore to render those knaves harmless and insure society against the disaster of their success, was the task of those more fortunately placed and trained. Society was not identical with economic life: the people made creative by an idea first dreamt the deed and then

produced the leaders in whom their ideas were incarnated. Thus Man, the Conqueror, might erect civilizations upon idyllic innocence and direct his own evolution by justice and liberty, golden age succeeding golden age. His mind was not troubled with the paradox of a liberty and democracy that limited freedom and equality in practice, but he was apprehensive about the growing tendency to regard the system it had produced in the South as an anachronism in American life, a sickly exotic from which all life and meaning was beginning to flee, leaving only an unkernelled feudalist shell to adorn the progress of an age whose spirit was the Renaissance maxim that wealth was the starting point of aristocracy—a spirit given artistic expression in the North by Copley and Stuart in their portraits of the Boston merchants, and increasingly so in the South by the evidence of finer qualities being nourished in a reasonable amount of security and a surplus of goods above the bare necessities of life, and the leisure to cultivate the arts of life made possible by slavery . . .

With Leopardi, the more hedonistic Benton and Clay would have said that there was nothing more unphilosophic than the effort to make the whole of life philosophic. To these vital pragmatists and activists, the Seamless Garment might be the spiritual ideal of the Church but it was not for temporal government guided by the requirements of circumstances. Instinctive men rather than abstract theorists, Benton and Clay each reflected the psychology of his environment in its economic and moral rather than its cultural expression; hence their particular type might have been labelled "peculiarly American" as a combination of hard-boiled political wisdom with an emotional flow of moral wisdom. Once, in the debate on the Independent Treasury Bill during Van Buren's presidency, Calhoun had answered Clay's "impudent" jibes at his metaphysics: "I cannot retort on the Senator the charge of being metaphysical. I cannot accuse him of possessing the

powers of analysis and generalization, those higher faculties of the mind (called metaphysical by those who do not possess them) which decompose and resolve into their elements the complex masses of ideas that exist in the world, as chemistry does the bodies that surround us in the material world; and without which those deep and hidden causes which are in constant action, and producing such mighty changes in the condition of society, would operate unseen and undetected. The absence of these higher qualities of mind is conspicuous throughout the whole course of the Senator's public life. To this may be traced that he prefers the specious to the solid, and the plausible to the true. To the same cause, combined with an ardent temperament, it is owing that we find him ever mounted on some popular and favourite measure which he whips along, cheered by the shouts of the multitude, and never dismounts till he has ridden it down."

To Clay, no less than Benton, the inescapability of material progress and the demands of his inner nature to take a place in that progress were not influences to be combated but used. Man, they knew, was no Conqueror but a Conformer who won only by yielding; and empire-builders, whether agrarian or industrial, were ordinary men doing their best to live under whatever conditions they found themselves, fixing themselves ere they could be civilized, transforming their transplanted life, setting the mark where government must painfully follow. If they saw nothing wrong in the government of a great people being conducted on principles so sketchy and empirical, that was because they were faithful to the present. In their environment, the exponent of a high degree of civilization must have written his fame in water instead of brass.

So Benton and Clay set their sails to the wind, being content to follow rather than to mould destiny according to the precepts of Epictetus given popular expression by the Quaker Elizabeth Fry. As a Missourian, Benton had favoured the settlers, fought land speculators, advocated expansion, de-

fended the tariff on lead and free salt, and demanded the free navigation of the Mississippi. As a Kentuckian, Clay had supported Jefferson's embargo policy, advocated bills to preserve the peace of the frontier and regulate intercourse with the Indians, defended Madison in the matter of the occupation of West Florida, and joined the War Hawks in the prosecution of the war with England. As Southerners, both had opposed any restrictions on slavery. Thus far in a broad nationalist sense they had moved with Calhoun.

But when the ardent nationalism aroused by the War of 1812 had died down, Calhoun reverted to particularist principles while Benton and Clay continued to advocate the provincial nationalism of the border-democracy. Though Clay fought for high tariff and a liberal construction of the Constitution as a part of his "American System," so long as he advocated expansion, internal improvements and the Missouri Compromise he and Benton continued together; but in 1824 when the latter renewed his old friendship with Jackson, and Clay adopted with Webster and Adams the cause of the industrial North, they too found themselves on opposite sides. As the three men grew older, the division was deepened with the force and meaning accumulated by the past. But in a few years more when the conflict was nearly over and time had resolved itself into the mere chrysalis of eternity, the three old opponents were to rediscover a measure of unity in hearts set against evil only.

"I admired Benton, I admired Clay yet more, I admired Webster on the intellectual side most of all; but I loved Calhoun," said O. Dyer, the Abolitionist. "He is inexpressibly urbane, refined, gentle; yet he is thoroughly manly, with a charming eloquence and engaging invincibleness."

Benton and Clay shone in life because their foibles and human weaknesses, no less than their achievements, endeared them to their fellows; Calhoun, without that self-love which thinks proudly of human nature, offered his gifts like Aristotle not to the man but to humanity, and so even in the flesh

was a legendary figure. But for those very reasons, Benton and Clay, invoked in the spirit, are delusive as ghosts because they seem so real: Calhoun as a ghost is as he was in life—a man ill at ease, of which sort all history is largely the product. As the names of Benton and Clay and Webster grow dimmer, that of Calhoun emerges clearer as representative of the historical and constitutional idea that has been the pivotal point on which the romance and example of America has ever turned: whether the hope of minorities for a just union can be realized in a puissant nation when that nation's purpose and direction of power is disguised or misunderstood.

V

After the adjournment of Congress in February, Calhoun went South, and despite a heavy cold, addressed a large gathering at Charleston on March 8. He spoke of the danger to the South from the strong anti-slavery sentiment in the North, and predicted that the time was not far distant when the North would have the power to pass the Wilmot Proviso. "But we have a remedy, for the Constitution is strongly and clearly on our side. Our Government is a federal one, and the States are constituent parties, standing to it as do the citizens of a State. . . There is in reality no hostility of interests between the two sections, and the political leaders in the North care little about slavery; but what they want is to secure the great prize of the Presidency, and parties are so evenly divided in the North that the fanatical Abolitionists, composing about five per cent. of the population, are ever in the position of being able to control the elections." He concluded his speech, "Let us show at least as much spirit in defending our rights and honour as they (the free-States) have evinced in assailing them. Henceforward, let all party distinctions cease—" thus he made his bid for a solid South which alone could resist aggression—"but far be it from us to force our own resources for protection.

Our object is to preserve the Union if it can be done consistently with our rights, safety, and perfect equality. On this we have a right to insist. Less we cannot take."

During the vacation he expressed the greatest apprehension as to the next session of Congress. At the same time he took occasion to oppose a movement in South Carolina for referring to popular vote the choice for the presidential electors instead of appointing them by the Legislature as was the custom, because he saw the politicians would ultimately control the popular vote, and the wiles of the politicians and the evils of caucus-rule would actually secure a less fair expression of popular opinion. At the same time he expressed his objection to the word "Democrat" as it had come to be used, as implying an absolute numerical majority, and reiterated his conviction that democracy needed checks to balance it.

Meantime, about the same time the Wilmot Proviso was being debated, Colonel Kearney was marching from Fort Leavenworth to Santa Fe (which he took without bloodshed) and proclaimed New Mexico, including Arizona, Nevada and Utah, as American territory. He then proceeded toward California; but halfway there he was informed by Scout Kit Carson that California was already secured, Commander Sloat in July having taken Monterey and declared California to be United States territory. The Americans illegally squatting in the Sacramento Valley had formally rebelled against Mexico under a Star-and-Bear flag; and General Frémont, Benton's son-in-law, had raised the American flag on the camp of Monterey in the name of "liberty and independence such as could be secured only in the bosom of the Union."

The news of these battles and victories aroused the expansionist sentiment in the country to the point of demanding the annexation of the whole of Mexico. Newspapers such as the New York *Evening Post;* officers of the Navy and Army such as Commodore Stockton and Colonel Jefferson Davis, the hero of the Battle of Buena Vista; and leading politicians such as John A. Dix, Lewis Cass, and Secretary of the Treas-

ury Walker, urged the Government to make an end of Mexico by prompt dismemberment. Polk found his Cabinet divided on the subject with the majority favouring the annexation of "all of Mexico." Declared Buchanan: "Destiny beckons us to hold and civilize Mexico." General Taylor's brilliant victory at Monterey had made him a likely candidate for the Whig Presidency; and as the administration did not care to aid its political opponents, its leaders cast about for a Democratic general. Benton, welcoming an opportunity to further his ambition, urged Polk to make him commander-in-chief of all the Mexican forces; but as Benton had never had any military experience, Polk was relieved to find that the Senate would not confirm his appointment. The only other alternative was General Winfield Scott of Virginia, already a candidate for the Presidency, and out of favour with the administration and quarrelling with the War Department. After some hesitation, most of Taylor's troops were placed under the command of Scott; and these, reinforced by others, set sail for Vera Cruz with the object of marching upon Mexico City. In March, 1847, the Mexican seaport was taken (the French had left ten years before), a victory which General Scott attributed to the skill of the forty-year-old Robert E. Lee of Virginia. David Farragut, the Tennesseean who had served on the *Essex* as midshipman under his foster-father David Porter, and had later commanded the *Natchez* that Jackson sent to Charleston against the nullifiers, anchored his flagship in the harbour after the Castle had surrendered.

Calhoun again urged taking an easily defensible line to force peace and prevent further bloodshed, and pronounced solemnly against conducting any treaty "in the halls of the Montezumas." But his words fell on ears deafened by the cannon of war, as the forces comprising the second line of operation, now augmented by half of Taylor's troops, began its long march to the interior following in the footsteps of the Spanish conquistadors of the Sixteenth Century. The next month the Mexican force sent to check the Americans

was swept aside at Cerro Gordo—Lee having devised a way to reach the heights and outflank the enemy, which netted six thousand prisoners—and passing the mighty peaks of Orizaba and Popocatepetl, entered the Valley of Mexico. Here many volunteers, their terms of enlistment having expired, were discharged and returned to Vera Cruz; but by September the splendid victories at Contreras, Cherbusco, Molino del Rey, and Chapultepec (where Lee, three times brevetted, won his rank as colonel) placed the City of Mexico in American hands.

On February 2, 1848, a treaty was signed at Guadalupe Hidalgo. Santa Anna, who had been bribed and broken his terms (he had been allowed to return from exile in Cuba in the hope of securing better terms, but this had only provided excellent leadership for his mixed following of four million Indians, two million half-breeds, and one million whites), was forced to resign. The new Government, confronted with Great Britain's refusal to interfere, had to accede to the terms dictated by the United States whereby Mexico got peace, a cash payment of fifteen million dollars, and the transference of three million dollars' claims against her to the United States; and the latter received a clear title to Texas as far as the Rio Grande and to the whole of New Mexico and California, and a canal-privilege across the Isthmus of Tehuantepec—a total of nearly one million square miles. Another small section needed by the United States south of New Mexico was to be subsequently purchased by negotiation.

Many future celebrities, brought together in a spectacular way by the war, returned to their various duties and avocations. The sixty-three-year-old Zachary Taylor, a Virginian by birth, a Louisianian by adoption, and a Whig by preference, "Old Rough and Ready" to his admirers, and "an ignorant frontier colonel" to Webster, began to perfect his plans for the Presidency. His son-in-law, the sensitive and imaginative Jefferson Davis, who had helped negotiate peace,

resigned from the Army and returned to his Mississippi plantation to begin his campaign for the Senate. The swarthy, romantic, short-statured Creole aristocrat from Louisiana, Gustave Toutant Beauregard, returned home in violent reaction against all Americans in general and against Jefferson Davis in particular. The elegant, smiling Winfield Scott continued in the Army, with a political eye on the Presidency. The conceited red-haired "Cump" Sherman, apeing the manners of the gentility while scorning the amenities from which those manners had sprung, wandered off to the Pacific Coast. The boyish and sandy-haired Hiram Ulysses Grant, Sherman's class-mate at West Point, imitating his hero General Taylor, racing and bragging at Natchotoches, sulking because he had been transferred to Scott before Monterey (where only mounted men were to be used), drinking too much for a youth of twenty-four, resenting the war and hating the Army, soon married and also wandered off to the West Coast. The intellectual young Robert E. Lee was subsequently placed in command of West Point. The serious young Virginia Presbyterian Thomas J. Jackson, who had graduated from West Point the year before, continued with his Army career. The forty-two-year-old Franklin Pierce of New Hampshire, who had enlisted as private and risen to the rank of colonel, was later to be his superior officer's successor in the presidential election. James Pile and his Texans; Doniphan and his Rough-and-Ready Missourians; Meade, McClellan, Bragg, Thomas, and a host of picturesque adventurers from all parts of the Union, returned whence they came. Houston had not taken part in the war, being in Congress at the time.

The Mexican War had had strictly defined aims, and these being accomplished there was no necessity for the total overthrow of the hostile country (to accord with the democratic thesis advanced by Lazare Carnot and Napoleon that nations fighting of their own volition might do so to utter extinction). Calhoun, sensing that democracy offered no

remedy against war, and indeed that war between democracies tended to become more ruthless than between dynasties (as was the case in Paraguay from 1835 on, where practically every male was exterminated), declared, in the debate of the act recognizing the war: "A deed has been done from which the country will not recover for a long time, if ever. It has dropped a curtain between the present and the future which to me is impenetrable."

VI

IT was, as Calhoun had said, the lowering of the curtain . . . before the final short act of the Greek tragedy in which he was the protagonist of a phase of the old myth unknown to Aeschylus . . . a curtain which, if it was but the frayed remnant of a gorgeous medieval tapestry, yet radiated with the dazzling lights of new achievement. And symbolical of life, the last picture on the curtain emerges first . . .

IN America, where practical endeavour met with the least opposition (except in the South) because cultural barriers were least established, progress was, unimpeded by considerations of order, a mere rush, and industrial unity paramount to political and social unity. Steamship transportation was making the greatest advancement, but railroads were steadily improving. The cars were generally crude wooden affairs, with running-boards along the sides, which jostled and groaned on their single-gauge tracks; but now there were first and second classes, with special cars for Negroes, and the first-class cars could be made up at night for sleeping so that the journey need not be interrupted for the passengers to spend the night at an inn. Baggage could be "booked" straight through—at the owner's risk. The conductor's formal attire of top-hat and medal of eight years before had given way to a neat uniform. Some trains carried only open-top cars for freight, and Harden's "express" idea had

developed into a regular business. Already the Erie was pushing towards its Dunkirk goal; the Pennsylvania to Johnstown; the Baltimore & Ohio had touched the Cumberlands; the Charleston & Savannah was in operation; South Carolina was operating her own State Railway, and Asa Whitney was projecting a gigantic trunk line to the Pacific. Inventors were experimenting with iron for rails and even for suspension bridges. Professor Morse had installed his successful experimental telegraph line between Washington and Baltimore, thus solving one of the problems of the uses of electricity that had occupied scientists for seventy-five years. Goodyear had patented his new process for vulcanizing rubber. The New York *Sun* had installed a new Hoe Rotary Press, enormously multiplying the output of the old Napier machine. Howe had patented his sewing-machine. Farm machinery was appearing in greatly improved form.

The circus had appeared with its animals and acrobats and side-wonders such as the mermaid, mechanical chess-player and general hoaxes to supplant the old premonitory clown in the village square and the peddlers' tricks in the country and bear and bull-baiting and cock-fighting. Women wore sleeveless jackets with small collars edged with flowers, flat-crowned straw bonnets, and fingerless lace mitts. Men wore mauve-coloured suits of long trousers and cut-away coats, with silk vest, soft shirts with the new detachable collar, and carelessly knotted black silk ties. In general the men were slovenly, taking the attitude that masculinity was to be distinguished by its utter lack of exterior polish; but the women had advanced to a silken elegance with the result that the social culture of the age was feminine and over-dressed in its new Polka fashions. There was a painful striving after European elegance, accompanied by fads for Greek, Roman, French and Georgian adornment and interior decorating; an esoteric taste for Italian and Florentine jewelry, embroidery, wax and hair designs; a stilted French etiquette, and a pretension for Italian Opera; a trend towards nature

cults that was popularized in flowers in carpets, wallpaper, carpet-bags and vests; and a fashionable interest in horticulture and in the sports (Corinthian yachting and horse racing having been introduced to take their places with cricket, baseball, sulky-trotting, and even fire-companies) as elegant forms of competition.

In sum, Jacksonian democracy penetrating the sphere of culture had risen to the top and was overflowing with all its diversities to seek a new level; but since equality produces no standard save in politics, and the pursuit of riches no satisfactory scheme of living, the crude and ugly competed on equal terms with the polished and beautiful (with inventions favouring the former); shrewdness and success with manners and honour; appearance with reality. In the West where one-third of the national population now dwelt, the frontier and the old romantic life were fast disappearing. The new conventions, with their conscious striving after morality through the usual maze of instincts and aspirations, fear and superstitions, had produced curious inconsistencies in social life: a frank recognition of petty male vices along with a ridiculously rigid standard of female chastity and a popular regard of divorce as immoral; widespread gambling on races and games, and an open feeling of hostility towards the theatre as a weapon of the devil; common swearing and coarse talk, and a prevalent demand that the press and magazines preserve a tone of high purity; a practice of acting on courage (as exemplified by Daniel Boone and the pioneers) and not training as the key to success; and a naïve faith in schools and education, and an amusing "scientific" attitude towards progress and inventions.

In every corner of the globe the revolutionary spirit was rampant, its levelling processes—industrial and liberal movements, scientific advancement, and naturalization—at work flattening the broad plain upon which the new structure was to be reared. On a plain so levelled there was a place for only one structure—a middle-class materialism divorced in

principle from all the sources of spiritual life; the Biblical Pharisaism with its powers magnified in a capitalistic era; the egotistical proletariat disdaining ideas for the sake of the machine which, as the technique of capitalism, was thus the chief source of materialism. But since any world-principle manifesting itself under a new form cannot be explained by economic situation alone without taking into consideration the spiritual attitude of men towards that situation, with the new middle-class economy there would necessarily be a middle-class religion and art duly reflected in literature. . .

AMERICAN adolescent literature, whose infancy coincided with the English period that produced the Regency poets and the Waverley Novels, had not won much praise abroad. The Reverend Sydney Smith, writing in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1820, declared that considering the opportunities and the favourable circumstances in which Americans had been placed they had shown "marvellously little to assert the honour of such a descent, or to show that their English blood has been exalted or refined by their republican training and institutions. . . In all four quarters of the globe who reads an American book, or knows an American play, or looks at an American picture or statue?"

In the South where the ruling class was more cultivated and the social life more colourful and free than in New England, Smith's Philistine estimate of personal worth by the vulgar test of production was contested by the spirit that it was better to be somebody than to do something. The members of this class, recognizing that life itself was an art and had its modes of style no less than the arts seeking to express it, devoted their talents to producing powerful and cultivated statesmen; but since the aristocratic spirit seeks precedent in literature more than in any other field, and the section having changed but little in the past century, the tendency was to command each generation to preserve its cul-

ture unchanged, just as political necessity forced the section to keep its government and society unchanged. Thus, since literature is an elaborated art resting on a co-operation between writer and reader, the lack of a definite Southern middle class (an educated lower class) to serve as an audience was also a deterrent to new writers articulating its romantic or naturalistic aspirations; so that beyond Jefferson's treatises, Washington's *Farewell,* Wirt's *Life of Patrick Henry,* Marshall's *Life of Washington,* Sim's and Baldwin's and Longstreet's tales, and the graceful and humorous characterizations of John Pendleton Kennedy, the South had produced nothing more in literature than expressed a pleasant sense that standard models were excellent; and since cultivated Southerners were not sufficiently nationalist to favour American literary expression but looked for it wherever it was to be found—in England, France or Germany—the typical Southern libraries, usually the private possessions of gentlemen, were traditional repositories of culture filled with serious standard literature (the aim of which was to express opinions of the world along with their prototypes in another world) which served as a magic mirror in which they viewed the prevalent tendencies of contemporary life. . .

THE first important American literature was confined to the section centring about New York. Charles Brockton Brown, the Philadelphia consumptive, had produced his *Lyrical Ballads;* Washington Irving his remarkably delicate sketches; James Fenimore Cooper his *Leather Stocking Tales* absurdly idealizing the West; William Cullen Bryant, the young editor of the New York *Evening Post,* a small volume of eight poems. Perhaps the American writer of greatest promise was Edgar Allan Poe, in that he was more completely independent of his locale and his era; and yet, paradoxically, he was the most typically American of all his contemporaries in that his freedom from either conventional or fleshly taint was a pro-

test that *real* American life should mean something more than human experience, and that American literature must spring from something more than the soil.

Scientific reports and treatises were beginning to make their appearance: geodetic and geological surveys, mineralogical and medical reports, all of which were significant in showing the general shift of interest from universal laws to the descriptive study of material on hand. Penny newspapers were growing in number and circulation. Another typical American literary development was the magazine, the best of which—and certainly the best vehicle of New England thought—was the *North American Review* (which, with the *Boston Athenæum*, had replaced the old *Anthology Club* of 1815) modelled after the great British reviews, the *Edinburgh* and the *Quarterly*, and now under the guidance of such men as William Tudor, Edward Tyrrell Channing, James Russell Lowell, and Jared Sparks.

In New England the new spirit had found popularity in orations and sermons, so that literature there was at first more or less opposed by the didactic essays and poetry of the past. By the middle of the century, however, the New England writers were the most important literary group of the time, including the historians William Hickling Prescott, George Bancroft, Richard Hildreth, and John Gorham Palfrey, all of whom were at their best when stirred by matters removed from actual human experience of their own; Jacob Abbott, whose *Rollo Books* had appeared five years before; the Abolitionist poets, John Greenleaf Whittier, James Russell Lowell, and Henry Wadsworth Longfellow; and the Concord Group, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, and Bronson Alcott whose *Orphic Sayings* were appearing currently in the *Dial*. . .

THE throwing-off of a dominant Puritanism in England and New England had undoubtedly influenced the literary renaissance in those countries as a parallel: that is, a religion so

temperamentally agreeable as Puritanism was to the English and the New Englanders was not to be lightly discarded; and though its dogmas were abandoned, its inhibitions lingered to be expressed in the pseudo-religions of politics and literature. Without an infallible authority (such as the Catholic Church) strong enough to enforce objective moral standards, the order of society at any given period determines the religious ideals, the moral interests, and the theological patterns of thought. Thus as the social order changes and new interests hold the attention, the old *institutional* religious systems become inadequate like outworn garments; but the temperament of men with its primal need of religion remaining unchanged, men must seek new institutions — rationalism, romanticism, transcendentalism, and naturalism (mere new names for their precursors' deism, sentimentalism, asceticism, and pantheism) — which are so inextricably interwoven that the only choice is to give one a dominant place.

This dominant place had been given by the New England intellectuals (and therefore by contemporary American literature) to transcendentalism, the doctrine that the intuitive and spiritual elements of mentality are dominant over the sense experience. Seeing the danger of over-emphasis, Kant, the master, had wisely put knowledge derived from the needs of the human spirit in a separate compartment from that derived from the experience of the senses, thus making the empirical supreme in its own realm though inferior to the transcendental; but his followers, Hegel and Schelling, undertook to give the transcendental dominance over the whole of existence. The romanticists carried the latter doctrine a step further, and sought an airy tower of imaginary luxury that could not be destroyed by certitude — thus avoiding the hurt to their vanity by the sneer of logic — and from Rousseau's emergence in 1749 to Hegel's death in 1830 and the new birth in France (to some extent in England also), turned the State into Rousseau's mechanism for giving effect to the universal will. The minor transcendentalists, either fundamentally

without imagination or discrediting it, came to decide that the fusion of the natural and the supernatural was to be found in a form of social organization: hence New England transcendentalism came to imply the power of mere mind to re-shape social life in accordance with their opinion; hence their slogan of free-will; hence the doctrine's popularity with reformers. Kant, as developed by Fichte and interpreted by Coleridge and Carlyle, was popular in America not because he was understood but because he apparently said what Americans wanted to hear.

Cultivated Southerners almost universally repudiated transcendentalism as a philosophy not true to itself; and in proportion as they made merry over the New England intellectuals, the latter branded them as backward men of their era. But assuming that theoretical absolutes do not obtain in literature, and that literary changes are governed to a great extent by specific circumstances, the question still remains as to whether intelligent men may not repudiate the literary expression of their time. Since it is idle to quarrel with the rise and fall of human thought, certainly no one acquainted with the continual flux of ideas could be anything but frankly sceptical in purely intellectual matters. Moreover, though even realists may have some traces of the longing for romantic illusion, they nevertheless must insist upon the use of historical imagination to gauge the relative truth in literature. Otherwise, finding reality in mere phrases, men by their volition as well as their will propound literature as *Absolute Truth*, thus branding themselves as fanatics; for moral truth is paradoxical and makes no effort to reconcile opposing verities (such as the immanence and transcendence of God, the omnipotence of God and the free-will of man, and so on). Such passionate desire for exactness is what makes the Puritan the eternal seeker after Absolute Truth – the Calvinist after *only* immanence, the romantic after *only* transcendence.

Thus the religion of the Puritan was, by dogma, Calvin-

ism, and, by inhibition, transcendentalism. The Puritanism defended by Jonathan Edwards had a certain piety which, when it became too burdensome, was translated into moralism that became known as Unitarianism. But when the adherents of the latter doctrine discovered that there are elements of piety which transcend the cultural point of view and create perennial problems such as whether the human spirit faces the universe as well in the individual lives of people as in a social order, Unitarianism became Transcendentalism. Actually, however, there was very little difference between Cotton Mather's *Magnalia* (written in the closing years of the Seventeenth Century to prove that during the first seventy-five years of New England there had flourished and died there so many regenerate human beings that a man of sense might *statistically* infer New England to be especially favoured of God) and the elegant sermons of Channing at his Federal Street Church in the presence of "good" Boston society, contending that Holy Scripture should be interpreted in the light of human reason and the ideas of Divine Attributes must come from the action of men's own spiritual nature. Both were arguments for the essential goodness and perfectibility of men, Channing's merely being a more general franchise of Election (though still limited to New England in spirit).

The transition of transcendentalism, through the intellectual reformers, to a peculiarly American conservatism was simply a manifestation of the middle-class spirit. The Yankee lecturers, of which Emerson was the most eminent, were only half-secularized preachers, men who stood and talked to ancestrally attentive audiences determined to be edified but on the lookout for error. If conservatism be defined as an attempt to formulate life, then a distinction must be made between the religious and the social conservative, for religious life can be formulated and social life cannot. Thus the religious conservative, regarding transitory human life with more indifference, and respecting tradition's authority, is as

ready to uproot new forms as old ones, and so is generally regarded as a dangerous social radical; whereas the religious liberal, ignoring any objective religious standard and eager to attack the records of human wisdom, and desiring to formulate life in terms of his innovations and fads as *fixed* forms over the lives and minds of men, are regarded as socially conservative. So viewed, it is apparent why conservatism follows "reforming," both being backed by the same temperament.

The American reformer was a type peculiar to the Puritan sections; a religionist who, having only the perverse remnants of a decadent religion to draw upon, found his outlet in a cause; and thus a faddist only for the sake of *fixing* his innovations as future conservative standards. Being vain (for no man can believe in his cause as infallible without believing equally in himself), the reformer wished to enjoy the fruits of success in his short lifetime, and so ran to excesses without regard for the chaos that followed. (The intellectual type was always careful to attack a distant evil, such as slavery, lest his intrepidity be called upon to sustain his cause; and moreover, the distance provided the illusion of directing affairs from a transcendent peak.) In fine, the intellectual-reformer was more often an untrained philosophical thinker who, acting on the fallacy that life can be simplified and that intellectual justification can make a thing right, easily arrives at the one remedy necessary to right a wrong condition — in contrast with the true philosopher who is never so completely sure of life that he is optimistic, and seeks any historical straw to which he may cling.

Thus Theodore Parker, the reforming Unitarian minister, was quite content to let others pry into the secrets of the Ideal Eternities while he concerned himself with the lines of conduct which men ought to follow in the new floods of light he turned on from a broad accumulation of facts. From there to active dislike of his opponents and indulgence in the freedom of personal vituperation was, of course, an indi-

vidual matter with Parker; for while most reformers spring from the lower classes, it does not necessarily follow that they may never outgrow the limitations of their origin and so never understand their social superiors.

Emerson was the best type of intellectual reformer, a man set apart by his genius, with the sense to cherish the heritage he had received from the masters and weigh it on its own terms. "Reform goes for truth, conservatism for comfort," he declared; but hastened to add, "We are reformers in the spring, in the autumn we stand by the old," thus naïvely conceding that his type of conservatism was merely the crystallization of his own early formulations. When Emerson, disconsolate in spirit after thirty years' failure, walked out of his Second Unitarian Church in Boston to become a professor and lecturer of "joyous nature," he proclaimed himself in his Gospel of Individualism to be essentially a man of his times, an exponent of the "full life" . . . and the full life in America then was one of optimism and innovation based on material prosperity. The animalism in action and nature served to compensate what his own puritanic nature lacked, just as his ready acceptance of transcendentalism provided the deficiency of Puritanism whose Brahmin he was by inheritance. This accounted for his immediate popularity as a lecturer, for any message that convinces every man he is endowed with great gifts will always be the popular one. The very method of Emerson's conversion, proceeding in his own individual way, confident of the spirit that guides men in their best intentions, was a sufficient justification for other men to go and do likewise, which in turn became the justification of ambition and success in other fields, particularly the commercial. His lectures were made from ideas jotted down at odd times which he huddled together to fill the time allotted, trusting with the calm assurance of his unfaltering individualism that the truth inherent in the separate memoranda would give them all together the unity implied in the fact of their common sincerity. . .

Out of the nature-religion of the transcendentalists grew what were known at the time as "crankeries." Not all of these were American: there were the phalanxes of Fourier the Frenchman; the projected colony on the Susquehanna of the Pantisocrats, Coleridge, Southey and Lovell; and Henry James, visiting Carlyle in England, had been attracted to the Sandemanarians, a group of primitive literalists dedicated to the love of books and refraining from eating blood. But significantly they all converged upon America, mainly because this country was wilder and less corrupted (strange inconsistency!) by Incorruptible Man, but also because it was the Natural Abode of the Noble Savages comprising the Indian, the Negro, and the indigenous rustic, about whom the romantics knew little and really wanted to know less. Four years before John H. Noyes established his "Perfectionists" at Oneida, a group of the *Dial's* transcendentalist writers (George Ripley, Charles A. Dana, and John Sullivan Dwight) had founded "Brook Farm" ten miles from Boston, patterning the community after the Fourier Ideal Society (but avoiding the free-love idea), to which came Nathaniel Hawthorne, a pleasant young short-story writer from Salem; Margaret Fuller, literary critic of the New York *Tribune*; George W. Curtis, and Bronson Alcott. Emerson was sympathetic, and though he came to visit, shrewdly refused to join the group.

Alcott, the school master whose novel Socratic method of teaching consisted of simulating a beautiful Greek philosopher posing questions to his interlocutors (Boston school children between the ages of three and ten) about the Soul, the Eternities, and the Sciences, later founded his own community at Harvard which he called "Fruitlands." But Alcott's activities were never centred, and while he wrote the *Orphic Sayings* for the *Dial*, he also made himself one of the trio of sages at Concord of whom Thoreau (probably because of his French inheritance) was the only one to carry his individualism to the logical conclusion of remaining unmarried and es-

tablishing himself in a solitary log cabin in a community all his own.

Stories, not considered at all amusing, were related about the Concord individualistic trio: how Thoreau helped himself to his neighbour's wood, consoling the latter with the assurance that the Lord would provide for *him*; how Alcott, opposed to killing any living creature, had disposed of the potato-bug problem in his own garden by dumping the pests into his neighbour's yard; how Emerson, pursuant to his moral right and aesthetic duty (as gravely concluded in the *Dial's* discussion) had gone with Margaret Fuller to see Fanny Ellsler dance at Boston (despite the latter's *personal* errors), and how, neither ever having seen a ballet, they had permitted themselves to enjoy it after labelling it as something else. "Margaret, it is poetry," declared Emerson. "No, Waldo, it is religion," decided Miss Fuller.

Whether true or not, these stories of starved spirits making their excursions in a union of religion and morality illustrated the common meeting-ground of the transcendentalists and the Protestant evangelists: the subordinating of reasonable religion to emotional fervour, the salving of the soul by acquiescence in exterior crudities. Deism, in its logic of attempting to define a reasonable belief in God without belief in supernatural revelation and miracles, had gone to the other extreme in William Paley and the Noetic School of Oxford with their absurd premise that since human reason in relation to Revelation was unimportant, the historical criticism was the proper basis of evangelism, doctrine a matter of evidences, and principles a matter of texts. The reaction to this was a romanticism in which God was a loving and intimate Spirit breathing in the mountains and flowers, "a Presence that disturbs me with the joy of elevated thought" (as Wordsworth expressed it in *Tinturn Abbey*), or, to the more simple-minded romanticist, a "God in Nature." Both extremes were expressions of the puritanic striving after *Abso-*

lute Truth; a temperamental blindness to paradoxical truth containing irreconcilable elements. The Eighteenth Century rationalistic conception of religion was a sham, but the contemporary romantics' attempt to reassert the Nineteenth Century's birthright was an exotic cause over-fed on fads and short-lived. Coleridge had brought the transcendental ideas of Kant and Schelling and Hegel into theology by giving spirituality to the reason and will; but his God of the *Lyrical Ballads* satisfied not even the poet's longing for a Loving Father, as he confessed in his *Biographica Literaria.* Rousseau coloured his deism with revolutionary naturalism to add to the worth and dignity of man the power of natural scenery to respond to his needs, and so established a harmony between man and nature; but he failed to establish a harmony between man and man. Newman had declared he found all the essential Catholic doctrines in the Protestant works of the past century; but he was leaving the Anglican for the Roman fold. Joan of Arc's belief in her Voices and fairy fountain was being made orthodox by the growing demand for her translation. The preaching of St. Francis to his birds would have been insupportable had the birds preached to him. That is, the primitivistic nature-element, always present in religion since the Psalmist cried, "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills" and found the Deity in the winds and clouds no less than Shelley; which had influenced Wesley's preaching and Cowper's declaration that God made only the country, served as mysticism to balance the transcendental-descendental aspect, or the polar extremes, of nature which the rationalists and romanticists distorted by emphasizing one extreme.

Any pure nature-religion is unmoral in that nature in all her implications provides neither an explanation of first causes nor a prophecy of ultimate purposes; and the understanding and experience which do not look for underlying principles are as fantastic and unmoral as nature herself. Morally speaking, there was little difference between the Puritan persecution of witches and the romantic prosecution of a spirit lurk-

ing in the mountains and flowers; but between both these conceptions and pantheism there was all the difference between monotheism and polytheism; and that was why the nature-worshipping transcendentalists presented not the gay aspect of a Dionysian revel but the drab naughtiness of the instinctive Puritan.

The latter distinction is important in considering the transcendentalists' sympathetic attitude towards the new scientific and democratic spirit and to its principal product, the Modern State. For while the new scientific spirit opposed the romantic conception of nature, making it difficult to believe in a God Who was interchangeable with nature, it also provided a new religion (for theoretical science is no less) to supplant the old, and, in asserting the theory of evolution, denied the traditional and aristocratic view of evolution as cataclysmic; and the new democratic spirit, based on the dogma of Perfectible Man, extended its claims to include moral as well as political sovereignty. The rising Modern State was, therefore, a category evolved from the sovereignty of a numerical majority, and as such was committed to the regulation of the morality of its constituency (or, practically, the morality of minorities), and, in the name of scientific progress, to the destruction of the principle of an historic Church. The Reformation had been fundamentally a puritanic revolt for political nationalism and industrial democracy. Men repudiated the Church not so much because it was an anachronism as because it conflicted with their own moral sovereignty which they proposed to delegate in a democratic way to their own agency; they disliked the historic hierarchy because it was self-perpetuating and therefore not subject to the common franchise; and they abandoned dogma not because it was chronic and tyrannical but because it denied their own individual infallibility, just as ritual denied the laic priesthood by admitting only the Ordained to the sanctuary. Moreover, by transferring the divine Attributes to themselves, men could merit Grace by such works as they

themselves declared to be good. And while the equalitarian spirit of Puritanism (the first form of Protestantism) gave men only the right to interpret the Bible (which took the place of tradition as the final authority), it was inevitable that this right should be carried to its logical conclusion of allowing men to decide what *was* truth, thus eventually dispensing with the Bible itself.

Thus the historic Church, with its emphasis on piety and perennial problems which transcend the cultural point of view, was brought into conflict with the new democracy in refusing to accede to popular moralism. Such a stand would be consistent in a monarchy which, since it is not in theory endowed with the moral sovereignty of the people, tolerates an objective authority (the Church) to limit despotism and evil; and thus placed, in defending the liberty of the people within an autocracy, the Church would be considered a democratic institution. But because Roman Catholics admitted a headship other than the State, their Americanism was seriously doubted; because they insisted that the civil law take cognizance of canon law, their loyalty was brought into question; and because they accepted dogma in competition with science, they were accused of encouraging ignorance. In turn, the Catholic Church distrusted Americanism, the church existing under *Propaganda* and their bishops holding commissions *in partibus infidelarium.*

For purposes of clarity, therefore, the Modern State must not only be regarded as a religion but as one of the sects – the controlling one. Its chief function being to control the morality of its constituency, it must ultimately destroy all competitors: first, by bringing them to a negation with equalitarian theories; second, by reducing them to anarchy by denying them a head of their own; and third, by limiting their social functions through the control of marriage and property. Hence, though the State may be lenient in the matter of recognizing freedom of religious worship, allowing the Church to hold tax-exempt property, and permitting the

clergy (as magistrates) to perform marriage ceremonies, even such tolerance is at best a benevolent tyranny. Liberty lies in complete independence: tolerance grants a limited freedom, since the power *not* to tolerate is thereby implied. . .

In New England, where Puritanism existed from the beginning, this nationalistic theory of the Modern State found its most agreeable soil; for there men not only had the privilege of deciding what was evil, but, fortified by the doctrine of Election, had the moral assurance necessary for forcing their notions on the un-elected. Moreover, they had discovered this could best be done by the State—by legislation; so that the broader the powers of the State, the more extensive the application of their brand of liberalism, of humanitarianism. In a community where individualism and optimism, communism and reform, were equally rampant, there was bound to be a constant divergence of new sects—the Unitarians and Transcendentalists, the Mormons with their new Prophet, the Seventh-Day Adventists with their Millennium, the Campbellites with their Apostles, not to mention the great evangelical bodies and the intellectual and militant reformers—all of which by their admission of anarchy in church government granted a monarchical power to the central Government, and by their emphasis upon humanitarianism gave a moral sovereignty to the State, more surely than the most nationalistic politics could ever have accomplished. From the dour Cotton Mather to the elegant Channing, from the vituperative Theodore Parker to the elegant Wendell Phillips, from the illiterate printer Garrison to his gifted friend Whittier, from the acid Sumner to his mellow friend Longfellow, was a solid chain—leading straight to the Modern State. . .

The South on the other hand had not been founded on the tenets of Puritanism. Her early leaders were falsely represented as atheists, they having been only superficially affected by the Deists from Blount to Voltaire to the extent

of tolerating a rationalistic philosophy largely in opposition to the narrow Puritan theism of the Timothy Dwights, and were for the most part religious men who, if they refused to regard man as essentially sinful (since he contained within himself the divine seeds of Redemption), also declined to believe in his perfectibility. Libertarians rather than humanitarians, they believed in an anarchistic State, or a State weak enough to leave the Church independent to practice dogmatic tolerance; and by dominating the masses culturally and politically, had kept the South solidly opposed to the whole idea of the Modern State.

Now, however, the life of the South, no less than the Yankee philosophy, was proving inadequate to the future as the Methodists and Baptists, with their democratic appeal to the emotions rather than personal conversion, their code of taboos, and their confusion of religion and moralism, made inroads on the former cultural solidity of the section. The old leaders had scorned to defend slavery except as a political institution, considering any justification of it on a purely commercial basis as degrading, and so were content to let its benevolent aspects stand as its sole apologetic. But as the new Evangelical landowners rose to riches in slaves they were beginning to defend slavery as a moral good, thus erecting a moral bulwark to support a business bulwark no less than the New Englanders had done for their manufacturing and their protective tariffs. And while it was true the new slave-holders acted in the defensive, it changed the institution from a political to a moral issue and therefore permitted its discussion on that score. The chief spokesman for the new-type Southern Puritans (for their attempt to prove slavery an *Absolute Good* so constituted them) was Thomas R. Dew, a professor of economics at Washington and Lee, who, in opposing Randolph's and Jefferson's plans to emancipate the slaves in Virginia, had declared it was time to stop believing in the fallacies of the Declaration of Independence; that American society was taking on a stratified form in

which men had their definite place, and that slavery had crystallized into a definite social system in the South as manufacturing, with master and workingman, had in the North. In the light of this dangerous heresy, the recent schisms between the Northern and Southern Protestants on the question of slavery primarily asserted the right to exercise private judgment in moral questions, and that in turn implied that the material interests at stake influenced each section. Had the Southern Methodists decided against chattel-slavery, and their Northern brethren against wage-slavery, or had both defied the State to favour either institution, they might have been classed with St. Paul against the Ephesians and the disgruntled silversmith Demetrius. But as it was, both spoke as though the State had the power of Indulgence; and since there is never such a thing as moral victory in reform (the State deciding all questions according to the material interests at stake), it must now be logically conceded that the State would have the same right to emancipate slaves as it had to protect industry. . .

How would the South fare in the present middle-class revolution? The dogs were no longer content to eat the crumbs that fell from the master's table. Should she feed her loaves to the multitude and gather up the fragments? The spirit of reform would be slow in awakening; slower in creating a new social order to fit the middle-class fabric already near completion in other sections.

Secession and reunion offered one recourse. A democracy after the Greek model would be ideal; but such a state, without moral sovereignty, offered no solution to the problem of public discipline. An established Church would provide a moral standard, but an established Church was possible only in a monarchy. After all, if the trend of the world was towards unity or centralization, was not a monarchy a more logical government than a democracy?

There was a short-lived revival of royalist interest, and

Calhoun, according to legend, interested himself in the fate of the lost Dauphin of France who was alleged to have been smuggled to America, and whose son, so it was rumoured, was put under the protection of the South Carolinian. Simultaneously there was an awakened interest in the historic Church movements: the liberal Catholic movement in France opened a new view of the Roman Catholic Church with its hierarchy affirming saintly and official inequality, and therefore its sound attitude towards slavery. But the French Movement, though liberal, very logically did not dispute the universality of the Church, and the South was not prepared to accept the Papacy. The Oxford Movement (or Puseyism, as it was called in the American Episcopal Church which Calhoun now attended) offered a *via media* between ultramontanism and Protestant anarchy; but so far it was not a popular movement in the South, having touched only a few of the upper class, and the Protestant organization and discipline of the Church, despite its Catholic doctrines and Orders, making it as vulnerable as any sect to the whims of hyperdemocracy. Moreover, the revolutionary process of turning back a page in religion required leaders of a radical temperament and a capacity for the lower element of oratorical powers; whereas, except for the picturesque and fiery Richard Froude, the Byron of the Oxford Movement, all the other leaders – the humble and shy John Keble, whose *Assize Sermon* preached twelve years before at the University and published under the title *The National Apostasy* had initiated the movement and the *Tracts for the Times*; the aristocratic, self-forgetful and erudite Edward Bouverie Pusey; the gentle and luminous-minded John Henry Newman, once vicar of St. Mary's and author of *Lead, Kindly Light*; and such laymen as Gladstone and Macaulay – were all men of conservative temperament and of a moral power so profound as completely to overshadow the mean consideration of temporal success. Finally – and that was a serious objection to it in the South – the Oxford Movement was so essentially English that it might

be considered nationalist. All the currents of the day were apparently moving towards the new middle-class conservatism and nationalism. Oddly enough, the disestablishment of the Church by Jefferson and his colleagues had been done primarily in the interests of a federal Union, since any State retaining the Church would have had to be independent. . .

In all parts of the world the revolution was sweeping on—its object materialism, its method reform, its end conservatism. In the young Germany of the Zeitgeist, of Friedrich List and the Zollverein, of Fichte, Goethe, the Grimms, Hegel, Heine, Humboldt, Koerner, Niebuhr, Schlegel, and Schopenhauer, where there was a sentimental homage paid to words that presumed reality in mere phrases, the force of the French Revolution and the revolt of Kossuth's Hungarians and of Mazzini's Italian republicans was rolling over the weak throne occupied by the half-mad Frederick William IV, sweeping away the remnant of Prussia's feudal reaction and helping establish a great unified Germany as a prelude to a general proletariat-revolution, and uniting German philosophy and idealism with French revolutionary logic—the latter representing middle-class political theories that seemed socialistic because they were against private ownership of land and industries, and whose connection with the proletariat (as they termed all non-capitalists) was solely to obtain their support.

In England the Chartist Movement had been inaugurated ten years before, extending parliamentary suffrage to the workers, abandoning the tariff and establishing free-trade, assisting schools with grants, and freeing slaves. The Utopian communist Robert Owen, whose workingmen's associations failed when the Chartist Movement was begun, was deserted by most of the fashionable "Owenites" or "Socialists" when they found he meant what he said; for the English, despite the social note in literature struck by Dickens and Kingsley, and the sociological speculation of Godwin, Paine, Cobbett, Bentham, Ricardo, Malthus, Mackintosh, remained true to type

in their inaccessibility to general ideas and their disposition to fight only for legal rights, so that economic science was the most that might be expected from them. "The English workman," declared an American writer, "likes to make pin-heads and remain ignorant of the whole pin, leaving other matters to inferior abilities. It is enough that he believes the Athanasian Creed, reverences the splendour of the Court, and —makes pin-heads."

In France, where the Greek spirit of form mingled with the Latin sense of movement, the new generation was discovering, in the austere outlines of the ideas of Socrates and Plato and the "rationalities" of the Eighteenth Century, that reason was a universe more perfect than and superior to what the senses found; and following out the duty of making such a universe of use, the new prophets were seeking to blend the confused and discordant social, political and artistic elements of life before the world was prematurely unified by science and commerce. The care-free life of the senses unburdened by social consciousness, the pursuit of beauty for its own sake, had had their day: the new generation again sought enlightenment. Auber's reflection on music, "When I was young it was my passion, my mistress; now it is my wife!" exactly described the new attitude towards romanticism: a tolerance for its permanent virtues and an appreciation of the fruit it bore; but the real craving was for an earlier idealism, the epochal and experimental rationalism of the Eighteenth Century, now enriched with greater human knowledge of the universe and applied science emphasizing material comfort and health.

In America and England the transcendentalists and romantics were agitating questions of an era that died with Byron and Shelley and Keats—the conservative reaction of those born early enough to respond directly to the French Revolution, and the bitter reproach of liberal youth resenting the poisoned anti-liberal atmosphere created by their turn-coat elders. They still thought of society as that artificially

created by the Holy Alliance from which war was excluded by the growing splendour of the Napoleonic legend in France, the talk of the new freedom in Germany, the nurturing of the seeds of revolt in Italy, and the independence of the English and Spanish colonies; and of human thought as that embodied in the poetry of Chateaubriand and the English Lake School, the Waverley Novels, the drama of Grillparser and Kleist, the music of Rossini, Weber and Schubert, the geographical and historical works of the Grimm brothers, Bopp, and von Humboldt, and in the startling new chemical and electrical discoveries. What they had not grasped (as France had) was that romanticism, which vainly sought to recapture mankind's birthright of illusion from the stoically rationalistic Eighteenth Century, had died like a sickly exotic more than a decade before.

Thus the transition from America, where the corpse of a dead era was being paraded by the intellectuals, to Paris, where the revolt beginning with the July Revolution of 1830 had the new realism as its catchword, was like the momentary passage of a century of change. In France the renascent romantic revolt of 1830 headed by Delacroix with his continual theme *The Ugly is beautiful!* (the sources of which were Scott, Byron, Constable, Boning, Goethe, Schiller, Daumier, Beethoven and Goya, and the object of which was to fight conservative academic superiority and official tyranny in government and art), had already died from lack of object and the haunting realization that a deeper danger than tyranny lay in that crescent phase of democracy which hates and condemns excellence. Chateaubriand was old and dying, his only audience a small group of elderly ladies. Musset's *Nights* were relished only by the extremely young. Balzac, author of the *Comédie Humaine*, who crowded eighty-seven novels in seven years like the mass-production of a modern manufacturer, had just died, crying bitterly: "France drinks the brains of men as savagely as she once chopped off their heads!" Victor Hugo was living down the *Hernani* scandal.

Even music, though Mendelssohn and Schumann still moved in a past circle of romanticism, was going political. Paris, where revolutions originate, still knew ideas and caucuses to be causes and not effects, and so loved them as much as love and more than liberty and prosperity: a maze of political theories that would be tried out a century later in England and America, and perhaps two centuries later in Russia, Italy and Germany. Hiding its scars of battle and its wrinkles of age with the artificial spirit of youth, Paris bade the world put philosophy above all things—to provide something solid and satisfying by which man could live. But the world preferred third-rate religions and literature and middle-class institutions. . .

WITH that quick momentum so typical of the French, the revolution started, reached its crescendo, and established the new mean level all in one year—1848. The principal cause of the republican opposition to Louis Philippe was his growing conservatism and fear. Before British trade he cringed. Because England disapproved he had refused to allow his son to be crowned King of the Belgians. He had refused to intervene against Russia in favour of Polish liberty. Formerly a Jacobin and liberal, he sent his sons to the common school, went walking with his umbrella like any ordinary bourgeois, and made of his reign a *juste milieu* between King and People. A throne surrounded by republican institutions! Only the English could swallow such a paradox—the logical French could not. "As for Louis," declared Madame la Comtesse Marie d'Agoult, whose salon was the rendezvous of the revolutionists, "attaching himself obstinately to maintain peace without drawing anything from it save prosperity and a false repose; infatuated with the mediocrity of his thoughts in measure as he sees it more generally shared . . . he ends by becoming not only a stranger to his country but *to his century*."

What did they seek, these revolutionists? "L'organization

du travail. A chacun ses besoins, de chacun ses facultés," demanded Louis Blanc, communist lawyer and revolutionary writer.

"That I contest," declared Ledru-Rollin, the socialist, "since it would separate reason and ideas from the proletariat, thus denying the definition of man as a pure worker. Ideas must always be the prime factor in history."

The thirty-seven-year-old Pierre Joseph Proudhon disagreed with both. The labouring man had no conception of himself as a pure worker, and ideas were for the intellectuals, the former merely acting upon them as doctrines. "As slavery is arson in that it destroys all that is desirable and valuable in human personality, so property is theft inasmuch as its profits accrue by the labour of others – even public property." Each worker was entitled to the full use and enjoyment of all propetry. As for ideas, always a political philosophy of ideas was succeeded by a political philosophy of concrete phenomena and men. All parties and governments were, if compulsory, a form of absolutism. Pure workers! Alas, in the sunset of revolution ideas ceased to be of primary importance: indeed, real revolutions were time-bombs which exploded when their causes had receded into the past. Reason could not subjugate vitality and spontaneity: in the end the latter must inevitably revolt against the former. Why go through unnecessary stages? The logic of democracy was – anarchy!

"Life is vitality, therefore reason is life only when it is vital reasoning," argued Lamartine. "Hence, if anarchy is the ultimate logic of democracy and not of life, then such logic may be discarded because it is unvital. In other words, the natural selfishness of man necessitates checks upon those of the highest ideals. Thus Christian socialism –"

"Human nature is of such high order that, separated from the bondage of the State and the tyranny of laws, it would spontaneously react against wrong-doing," insisted Proudhon.

"The Golden Rule is the innermost law of the individual

conscience," admitted Lamartine, "but if anarchy is the logic of democracy, is not terrorism the logic of anarchy? For suppose men choose not to obey the Golden Rule: must there not be an agency to enforce justice and protect other men from animal violence?"

"Justice demands only a social human life on the basis of a single law that contracts must be lived up to," said Proudhon. "Such a system of government was the Church in her heyday; such an organization were the fraternities of the Church, and even those separated from the Church."

Lamartine was ready for the opening. "If the Church once offered the ideal of democracy and the best of benevolent anarchy (justice according to the law of contracts), why not restore the Church to authority?" Gregory XVI, identified with the Risorgimento, having for the past fifteen years prepared the way for *il papa Re*, Pius IX was now on the papal throne; the liberal Catholic Movement was under way; and while Pius had never subscribed to the trend of the French Revolution and had denounced that "Terror of Kings," the Carbonari of 1821, he had never pronounced against democracy, the sovereignty of the people. As Robert de Lammenais had concluded, it was from Catholic christianity that the spirit of true democracy must be gleaned. . .

The February riots—"la révolution du mépris" Lamartine styled them—in which the middle-class National Guard joined the populace, followed by the abdication of Louis Philippe, brought back many exiled revolutionaries. Louis Auguste Blanqui, an old man at forty-three with white hair, deep-set flashing eyes in a pale face, and a small body twisted by disease, suffering and imprisonment (his sentence to death had been commuted to life imprisonment for the outbreak of the Societé des Saisons in 1839), founded the *Globe* and his *Societé Republicaine Centrale* whose theory of a proletarian dictatorship had already brought him into conflict with the more moderate republicans. This tyranny of the continued use of revolutionary power that repudiated democracy and

universal suffrage he justified by saying that the social system being dangerous, heroic measures were needed; and the present revolution being merely a change of name, a counter-revolution must follow up the first *coup d'état* with another in order to produce a revolt in the provinces where he advocated setting up arbitrary local governments (*communes*) for the time being. "The people need the revolutionary power to govern themselves," he declared. But all reasonable men knew that so far as Blanqui was concerned that time would never arrive. Despite his vigour in assailing the transcendental, he was really denouncing all that was stongest in himself: the Puritan's love of primitivism and unity seeking to surmount the allegiance which necessity claims of the reason. And yet men were forced to believe in this miracle of fire under ice, of amazing vitality of spirit and speech in a worn vehicle, for his deep, strident voice carried an eloquence of savage forces that stirred the soul.

The Italian patriot and moralist, Giuseppe Mazzini, passed through Paris *en route* to Italy from his exile in England. Concerning national problems, this forty-three-year-old semi-invalid's thought was clear and precise, and no one understood as he did the complex Italian-Austrian-Slavic future. But when it came to social questions, he talked of faith, love and self-sacrifice; denounced the Utopians of Cabot's communistic school for substituting the idea of materialistic well-being for the ideal of moral progress and thus reducing civilization to a society of bees and beavers; announced that he would oppose in Rome the confiscation of the papal emigrés' property, and in general practiced what he preached. In some ways, however, he was fantastically obsessed with the past: thus he was convinced that Rome was the moral centre of Italy, of Europe, and of the world, and openly described Ledru-Rollin as "an excellent man but governed by a curious misconception that the French, and not the Italians, are the initiator-people, an error that vitiates his entire philosophy."

"Imbécile!" was Karl Marx's estimate of the Italian patriot;

and Mazzini retorted by describing Marx as "a man of acute but dissolvent genius, domineering in temper, jealous of the influence of others, without strong philosophic or religious beliefs, and I fear with more of anger in his heart than of love."

But Marx, just back from Paris after a three years' exile in Brussels, was at thirty a young man to be reckoned with. Born at Trèves, the son of a Jewish lawyer turned Lutheran to qualify as a Rhenish-Prussian office-holder; pupil of Hegel with Bakunin at the University of Berlin where he was a member of the "Young Hegelians"; editor at twenty-five of the *Rheinische Zeitung* suppressed for its liberal policy; an exile in Paris where, coming in contact with French revolutionary and communistic theories, he established his *Vorwaerts!* which was quickly suppressed by Guizot at the Prussians' request; an exile in England with Engels where he absorbed the advanced economic science of that country, he was now *en route* to Germany to follow up the new revolts with his timely *Communist Manifesto* celebrating the birth of modern socialism. Actually there was nothing unique in his doctrines, as they were to be found in writers who philosophized before the Christian era, and in the whole mosaic of doctrines compounded of Hegel, Feuerbach, Fichte, Ricardo, Robertus, Sismondi, Bentham, and Weitling, as well as his immediate contemporaries, Robert Owen, Blanc, Proudhon, Bakunin, and his close friend Engels. But if he lacked originality and idealistic craving and imagination, Marx was a competent psychologist, a practical scholar, and a capable interpretive journalist, and thus a true intellect uniquely endowed to found institutional economics – the study of facts not confused with abstractions.

According to Marx, the bourgeoisie or capitalistic class had grown in wealth and political influence through the factory system that at the same time had created an exploited class, the proletariat, which, reinforced by the peasants and artists, would overthrow the former. In time capital would

be controlled by the few, thus enabling the proletariat to dispossess them by political means and to inaugurate a communistic State. Thus he laid down the formula that the great business of socialism was to school and ripen the proletariat to take possession of this power; the principle that democracy was the cardinal point of socialism (since the proletariat must govern itself and not be governed *even for its own good*); and the method of superseding capitalism, not destroying it by violence. Or, to paraphrase his formula, socialism was capitalism of the proletariat, or conversely, capitalism was the ex-socialism of the proletariat.

The obvious result of the Marxian plan was, of course, to set up a permanent middle class (since the proletariat as it became propertied and conservative would be continually reinforcing the middle class) of perpetual tyranny. Thus it was to be expected that he would be an advocate of the new middle-class nationalism, though he justified his zeal for a united Germany by asserting that the class struggle of the bourgeoisie and the proletariat must first come in order to accomplish collectivism and destroy all classes, and that therefore nationalism must first come to crush all remnants of the Prussian feudal reaction as a prelude to the great proletarian revolution. America, he thought, was in a different category; a country rich, vast, expanding, with purely bourgeois institutions unleavened by feudal remnants and monarchical traditions and without a permanent and hereditary proletariat, there were, as yet no classes with opposing interests in that bourgeois Paradise.

When Greeley employed Marx to write for the *Tribune* he surely sensed that if the latter's European conception of the State and his freedom from sanctimoniousness and sentimental liberalism were eliminated, there was little difference between his socialism and the national democracy then being furthered by the American middle-class industrialists. For middle-class dictatorship, economic nationalism, and capitalism (which in action is essentially communism in that the workers

are expected to serve the factories as in Europe they were expected to serve the State) constituted no less a menace to democracy (when the capitalists attempted to push these principles into the State) than did the Marxian system. From Jewish monotheism to English Puritanism to New England communism was a logical sequence. And all opposed the Jeffersonian doctrine that the State should exist *for the people. . .*

MEANTIME, the revolution was spreading over Europe. In England, Wellington had been recalled and a vast army assembled. Feargus O'Connor, "calling on the Queen" with another bulky petition stowed in two cabs, was defeated by rain and lack of support. In Denmark, half his subjects were in rebellion against Frederick VII. In Germany, Berlin had capitulated to the revolutionists. In Italy, the republicans had driven out the Pope and established a republic. In Russia, Nicholas I, frowning upon the rebels, was threatening to send troops to aid the Austrian Court which had been driven out of Vienna. Kossuth had established a separate Hungarian Republic. In France, the Chamber of Deputies held to the tricolour at the Palais Bourbon in west Paris, the workmen to the red flag at the Hotel de Ville in east Paris. "The government," cried Blanc, "must guarantee the existence of the workmen *by work!*"

In June the Red Republicans set up barricades on the Faubourg St. Antoine and dared the government to strike. The Archbishop of Paris mounted the barricade, attended by two vicars in ceremonials, his cross borne before him, a green branch in his hands, to appease the fury of the mob. He was shot in the loins and died at the hospital at Quatre-Vingts. "Bonus pastor da vitam suam pro ovibus suis," he had told those who tried to dissuade him. General Cavaignac brought up troops and restored order with considerable bloodshed. "It was not so terrible as the tragedies of the early republics and empire," Heine wrote laconically, "there being only a

thousand corpses or so. It seemed that the political romanticists were annoyed; they wanted a greater piece."

All the leaders of the revolt were imprisoned or exiled. The Assembly decided to elect a President for four years by universal suffrage to preside over the Second Republic. Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, nephew of the little Corsican, a crafty, insincere and ambitious opportunist who had twice attempted a revolution during Louis Philippe's reign, was chosen. "A Napoleonic restoration," Blanc had warned the people, "would be a despotism of the Bourbons without its glory."

Everywhere the forces of reaction and conservatism seemed to be in control, establishing the mean level of the world-revolution. In England, Wellington had the upper hand. In Germany, Prussian troops were putting down the revolutionists, and Marx had left there forever to go to England. In Italy, the republicans under Garibaldi were attacked by French troops and the Papacy restored. In Austria-Hungary, the Austrians defeated the Italians under Mazzini and, aided by the Russians (who, according to Mazzini, were destined later to wipe them off the map) destroyed Kossuth's Hungarian Republic. Poland, after her abortive attempt at revolt two years before, remained as she was carved up by square miles and population at the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and served up to Russia, Austria and Germany.

In America, the Democratic Party was almost split on the slavery question and the forces of reaction in full swing under the Whig-Republicans who at their June convention had nominated their second general, "Old Rough and Ready" Zachary Taylor, hero of the Mexican War. But by whatever name they might be called, and however long it might take to sever the old ties, there were now only two real parties in the United States – the North and the South. And it was significant that it was not the points of disagreement between the anti-slavery radicals in the North and the slave-holders in the South that would lead to the inevitable clash, but the single point on which they agreed – the logic of disunion.

And it was neither tradition, popularity, or even respectability that would elevate the new Whig-Republican Party to the dignity of standard-bearer of the Union, but the cleavage in the old Democratic Party itself – the very last thing the latter wanted to accomplish. Yet, it is a travesty of men's efforts that they must accomplish the ends which they oppose, the conservatives by reaction and repression opening the flood-gates of revolution, the radicals by excesses and intolerance again closing those gates upon liberty and freedom. Thus do men come to what is written upon their foreheads by a path whose order is mere routine like that of ants, only lifted above inferior creatures by a special intelligence that enables them to dream and adventure, and progress by experiment towards that to which their elaborate social organization lays claim. . .

A FITTING climax for the end of the era was the death of the seventy-six-year-old Klemens von Metternich, for forty years head of the conservative Austrian government; for in this old Rhenish nobleman (who if he was consistent in anything it was in his hatred of republicanism since the time as a student at Strassbourg in 1799 he first saw the unsightly mob functioning, depriving the princes of their authority, the nobles of their land, and the prelates of their rights of conscience) was symbolized the old-school diplomacy of balancing revolution and reaction. If Metternich feared revolution from beneath, he hated reform from above. To him the workers were merely greedy; the intellectuals, with their continual ranting about the perfectibility of man, mostly ridiculous; and the great middle class, who would never rest until they had secured the control of the national finances and policies to further their self-interest, ruthlessly materialistic. "What the people want is peace, not freedom," was his conclusion; and he used his talents to that end which he believed could be best secured by the rule of an *élite international* and the Church. To him the aristocracy was as much a reality as

the three classes of workers, intellectuals and industrialists. What he failed to see, however, was that the aristocracy, like the Irish elk whose antlers grew too heavy to support, overstimulating their nerves and extinguishing the race, might become the prey of the new middle-class life which sought reaction merely to bring political power to a level with middle-class power and its invention, the Modern State, which in turn would absorb the spontaneous social effort that sustained and nourished human destiny.

IV. THE JUDGMENT

Industrial Democracy [1848-1861]

The Revolution of 1861

Calhoun, Davis and Lincoln

In the youth of a State, arms do flourish; in the middle age, learning; and then both of them together for a time; in the declining age, mechanical arts and merchandise.

Bacon

I

THE restoration of the French Republic was greeted in America with great excitement, and resolutions were offered in the Senate congratulating the French nation on their success. Calhoun, who suspected that Louis Philippe was a better democrat than Louis Napoleon, and that his *juste milieu* was nearer the First Republic than the Second Republic would be, opposed the resolutions. "The time has not yet come for congratulation," he told the Senate. "Much remains to be done. The French have *decreed* a republic, but it remains for them to establish a republic." Back of his stand was the conviction also that the resolutions smacked of self-congratulation. "It is a great delusion to suppose it our mission to spread liberty over the world," he had said in reference to the War with Mexico. "None but a people advanced to a high state of moral and intellectual excellence are capable in a civilized condition of forming and maintaining free governments"; and added that such institutions had not been altogether the result of foresight and wisdom but of some fortunate combination of circumstances. Our own so grew, and was "superior to the wisdom of any or all of the men by whose agency it was made."

Both political parties met in convention in May. The Democrats at Baltimore adopted a platform approving Polk and the Mexican War and nominated Lewis Cass of Michigan, an expansionist who did not object to slavery in the territories, on a platform advocating the right of the territories themselves to decide their form of government. This, however,

was not satisfactory to the Southern delegation which threatened to withdraw. Van Buren, seeing an opportunity in the slavery quarrel to avenge himself on the party that had ignored him, succeeded in splitting the New York delegation. The reform element re-split into the "Barn-Burners" (so called because of their impractical ideas like those of a man who burned his barn to get rid of the rats) who acknowledged the leadership of Van Buren, William Cullen Bryant of the *Post*, and Silas Wright; and the "Hunkers" (so called because of their hunger for public office) under the leadership of William L. Marcy. Both schismatics sent delegations to the Utica Liberty Party Convention, but later the Barn-Burners withdrew and the convention nominated Van Buren on a radical anti-South platform endorsing the Wilmot Proviso. In August the "Free Soilers" met in Buffalo and nominated Van Buren and Charles Francis Adams on a strictly anti-slavery platform of *Free Soil, Free Speech, Free Labour, and Free Men*, demanded the rescue of the Government from the slave-power, and acknowledged the right of Congress to impose its will upon all territories beyond the original States. Calhoun had thrown away his prospects by his stand on the Mexican War; but the South made a grave mistake in not uniting on Cass (who was not an anti-slavery man) and thus by a combination with the West preventing the victory of the Whig-Republicans.

The latter met at Philadelphia. Young Thurlow Weed took charge of the Convention, snubbed Clay and Webster, and gave his support to General Taylor. Nothing was said about slavery, Taylor being himself a slave-holder and it seeming likely that many Southerners would vote for him particularly as they were dissatisfied with the Democratic platform and candidate. The Whig-Republican victory would have been a repetition of the Harrison triumph had it not been that many anti-slavery Whigs were as opposed to the tactics of their party as Democrats were dissatisfied with theirs. "It is evident," cried delegate Allen of Massachu-

setts, "that the terms of the union between the Northern and Southern Whigs are the perpetual surrender by the former of the high offices and powers of the Government to their Southern candidates, and to such the free States will no longer submit. I declare to this convention that the Whig Party is here and this day dissolved!" Henry Wilson, later Senator from the same State, declared, "I came to this convention a Whig, committed unreservedly to the Whig Party and its organization. I asked of this convention to nominate a Whig unreservedly committed to the principles of liberty. We have nominated a candidate who has said to the nation that he will not be bound by the principles of any party. Sir, I will go home, and so help me God I will do all I can to defeat the election of this candidate!" Seward, however, spoke for Taylor as did Abraham Lincoln, the latter in a speech at Worcester comparing the Free-Soil platform to a pair of trousers which a Yankee peddler recommended as "large enough for any man and small enough for any boy."

In the meantime the bitter factional fight over the new territories was continuing in Congress. Douglas's Oregon Bill, maintaining popular or "squatter" sovereignty and the right of each territory during its territorial period to make laws to establish or exclude slavery, was bitterly assailed by Calhoun on the ground that neither a territory nor Congress had the right to legislate upon matters on which the Constitution already spoke clearly. Squatter sovereignty, he declared, was worse than the Wilmot Proviso in that it contained dangerous constitutional doctrine. Polk expressed resentment against Calhoun for "mounting the hobby of slavery as the North mounted that of anti-slavery"; and added naïvely: "They both forget that the Constitution settles these questions which were the subjects of mutual concessions between the North and South." Benton was in favour of voting down this "pestiferous question which, like the frogs of Egypt, intrudes itself everywhere." But Calhoun, continuing his policy of forcing the issue, declared: "I hold the obligation to repel

aggression to be not less solemn than that of abstaining from making aggression." The unlimited right of Congress to govern the territories – and hence to exclude slavery – was assumed under the power conferred to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory and other property belonging to the United States, but every word of this clause referred to public lands only and no general power of legislation was conferred by it. Foote wanted to urge the extension of the Missouri Compromise line, but Calhoun so strongly disapproved that he abandoned the plan. The latter was now, like the other side, demanding the whole loaf. When it was pointed out that the laws of Mexico had excluded slavery, so that in taking over the territory the extant laws must also be considered, he lost patience and snapped: "So did the Mexican law exclude the Protestant religion! And since our Congress cannot prohibit the Protestant religion in the territory, it is apparent that the doctrine being maintained against the South leads to absurdities.

"The Union is in great danger," he went on, "and the historian of the future will record that the Ordinance of 1787 which was opposed by the South until it became a compromise securing the return of fugitive slaves; the Missouri Compromise which was carried by the almost unanimous vote of the North; and the present agitation, are landmarks in the history. Whether there will be another chapter we do not know, but the philosopher will find all through the history a more recondite cause in a proposition which originated in a hypothetical truism and which has come to be most false and dangerous – the proposition now an axiom that 'All men are born free and equal.' But men are not born; infants are born. Nor are infants born free, and are even incapable of freedom when born." He consented to a plan for referring the perplexing question to the Supreme Court, but it met with little enthusiasm among the anti-slavery element for the reason that they well knew the destruction of the whole social order

of the South necessitated the overthrowing of the Constitution and the law.

In the end Douglas added an amendment to his bill to carry the Missouri Compromise line to the Pacific "to be in full force and binding for the future organization of the territories of the United States"; and this bill was passed, Calhoun voting for the amendment but against the bill. However, the House refused to agree to the amendment, and the bill was sent back to the Senate with a mere prohibition on slavery. Once more the bitter contest broke out in the Senate. Calhoun stuck to his course, but Benton, in his desire to give Oregon a government, shifted to the bill as it was returned from the House.

"The great strife between the North and South is ended," cried Calhoun. "The North is determined to exclude the property of the slave-holder, and of course the slave-holder himself, from its territory. The separation of the North and South is completed."

Benton, irritated that practical endeavour should be obstructed, replied that all this talk of disunion was idle, 'a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.' Finally the bill was passed – with the clause excluding slavery in the Northern territories. The North had won. There would never have been any slavery in the Northern territories anyhow, but Congress had asserted its right to decide the question – as a principle. There was now no limit to which they might not go.

Calhoun hurried to the President. He was too wise to urge a veto; but when the bill was finally signed it contained Polk's explanation that his reason for signing was that all the region concerned lay north of the Missouri Compromise line. This was cold comfort to the South, but at any rate Oregon had a government and was no longer a shuttlecock in politics. The Southern papers wrote bitterly of the defeat of the South and there were a few meetings of public protest; but their spirit was one of sorrow rather than anger. In the North it

was a matter of great surprise that the South should be so concerned over an abstract principle where they had no material interests at stake.

At the December session, before the inauguration of Taylor, Calhoun came into conflict with his old adversary Webster upon the same question. So far any expression as to the extension of the Constitution or slavery into the new territories had been carefully kept from the bills, but now the Southerners were deliberately trying to insert such expressions in a bill to provide funds for the territories to test their value.

Webster declared that the whole idea was preposterous, and that the Constitution did not and could not extend to the territories. "If Cuba became ours, does anyone suppose that the *habeas corpus* and trial by jury would be established in it by the mere act of cession?" he asked.

"The Constitution interprets itself," said Calhoun. "It pronounces itself to be the supreme law of the land."

"What land?" demanded Webster. "There being but thirteen States when the Constitution was drawn, no other land could have been intended. Therefore, never having been slave-States the new territories are free-States – and subject to the laws of Congress."

"The land – the territories of the United States are part of the land," declared Calhoun. "It is the supreme law, not within the limits of the States of this Union merely, but wherever our flag flies, wherever our authority goes, the Constitution in part goes. Not all its provisions, certainly, but all its suitable provisions. If the Constitution does not go there, how are we to have any authority or jurisdiction whatever?"

Whether or not either Calhoun or Webster remembered that the expression "supreme law of the land" was not to be found down to the last few days of the colonial Convention, but read "supreme law of the *respective States*," is not apparent; but that Webster's argument had no logic, and that Calhoun dared not press his logic to a conclusion – namely, that if the States were superior to the federal Government, then

the admission of any new State was illegal – made their debate a mere verbal fencing for position. This bill, like the Oregon bill, was refused by the House with the amendment, and the Senate was again compelled to yield in order to procure funds for the new territories.

But Calhoun was not alarmed unduly. The crisis in Southern affairs was real, the control of Congress and of both major parties now being in Northern hands. In January a meeting of Southern senators and congressmen was called to devise ways of protecting the South, and Calhoun as chairman was asked to draft an "Address to the Southern delegates in Congress and their constituents." The document, modelled after the Declaration of Independence, recited a list of grievances against the North, reviewed the constitutional history of slavery, declared the existing scheme of politics was doomed to disaster, and called for Southern unity in holding their rights paramount over party allegiance . . . lest the dominant Northern party, seeking abolition as a political issue, be permitted to enfranchise the Negroes for their own political aggrandizement to hold the Southern whites in subjection, thus producing such intense hatred between the whites of the two sections as to make of the future a "carnival of profligacy and a bottomless degradation." He reviewed the compromises of the past, declaring them now to be ineffectual in view of the progress of unconstitutional centralization in the meantime, and concluded that the domestic tranquillity of the South could be secured and the Union perpetuated only by a new device. To this end he advocated an amendment to the Constitution replacing the single President by a dual executive, each of the two chief magistrates to be chosen by one of the great sections of the country and the assent of both to be requisite for the validation of acts of Congress. Soon after the address had been circulated the legislatures of South Carolina and Mississippi called for the assembling of a "Southern Congress" to put the machinery of the "United States South" into operation.

Politically the Southern movement was a fiasco, Southern Unionists such as Toombs and Houston, still clinging to their outmoded Whigism and the national-party idea as indispensable to the unity of the country like decaying elastic bands holding together the States, having got in control of the meetings. But Calhoun, now completely cured of his early ambition, no longer hesitated in putting his faith in a losing cause. He had left but one desire: to save the South. No reward now could recompense him for the loss of this opportunity to extend himself into a longer existence than remained of the short human span; and such fame as he should have must, like the perfume of flowers, come without thought, rather than as a probability of merit. Furiously he turned on the Southern Unionists, ridiculing their notion of waiting "an overt act on the part of the federal Government" before attempting resistance, declaring that no more overt act was needed than the flat refusal of the North to carry out the solemn stipulation of the Constitutional agreement to return fugitive slaves. "The attempt to recover a slave in most of the Northern States cannot now be made without the hazard of insult, heavy pecuniary loss, imprisonment, and even of life itself." He quoted a recent homicide of this sort, and concluded: "We doubt, taking all together, whether a more flagrant breach of faith is to be found on record. . . Destruction of the most vital interest of the South faces us; for these efforts, if unchecked, can but lead to emancipation. Indeed, that result would probably come in time without any definite law upon the subject, from the growth of a feeling inconsistent with the existing relations between the two races. Nor will the matter end there, but another step will be taken and the right to vote and hold office conferred *on the Negroes* in order to raise them to political and social equality with their former owners. The result of this would quickly be that they would *unite politically with the North* and hold the South in subjection. We would change places with them, unless we should flee from our old homes. Our union in self-

defence is absolutely necessary to prevent this dire result."

In this session were Horace Greeley, who wrote many speeches on many reforms which were never delivered but published in his *Tribune*; and the forty-year-old Abraham Lincoln, who proposed some minor resolutions on the subject of internal improvements and criticizing President Polk's Mexican War message, and related comic anecdotes in the popular kindly-wise manner of the indigenous rustic. A drunken fellow, he declared, had been indicted for hog-stealing, and after hearing the clerk recite that he *did steal, take and carry away ten boars, ten sows, ten shoats, and ten pigs*, exclaimed: "Well, by golly, that's the most equally divided gang of hogs I ever heard of!" "If there is any gang of hogs more equally divided than the Democrats of New York about this time, I have never heard of it," concluded the first-to-be Abolitionist-Republican President. . .

Towards the end of the session Calhoun fainted in the lobby of the Senate and was carried to the Vice-President's room where Robert Barnwell Rhett found him.

"My career is nearly over," said the old prophet sadly; "you younger men must take up the work."

"I hope not, sir," said Rhett, "for never was Calhoun's presence more valuable to the South than now."

"There, indeed, is my only regret at going." The tears flowed down his wasted cheeks. "The South . . . the poor South."

In the spring he was at his plantation, *Fort Hill*. "The jessamine and the dogwood are in bloom," he wrote, "and the forest has just commenced clothing itself in green. . . The season has been wet, but everything looks beautiful. Even the old field beyond the garden looks as green as a meadow. In the field beyond it a fine crop of oats, just shot up, completely covers the whole ground, presenting an unbroken mass of green. The big bottom on the other side is covered with a superb crop of corn which covers the whole with a deep

green. Back of it lies Fort Hill with its harvested wheat in shocks. The spring has been too cool and wet for cotton, but mine looks well, and with my hillside drains and serpentine rows, really looks handsome." . . . It was not a pretentious plantation, *Fort Hill*, compared with the great Southern estates. There was no "Village" of slaves; only a few servants, overseen by his own son-in-law. Their quarters were so near he could see them at their work – the men feeding the work animals, filling the water-wagons, assembling the implements for the field; the women caring for the gardens and household work; the aged puttering about doing odd jobs, and the children hackling corn-shucks for mattresses.

"I ride or walk according to the weather twice a day for the double purpose of exercise and superintendence, though I have no trouble as Frederick has become a first-rate overseer. . ." In the corn fields the stalk was in shoot and tassel, ready to fructify, the ear beginning to form. Between hills, men with scythes were cutting peanut bushes to provide, when dried, fodder for the oxen and mules. In their wake came the ploughmen, and behind them the seed-boys with great gourds on their shoulders strewing seed-corn for a second crop. Later, when the corn was gathered in for grain and forage the hogs would be turned in the field for fattening. Hoemen would be hilling up the long vines in the potato fields, trimming them, taking slips for seed-potatoes. Still later in the summer the yams would be ripe. In the next field, women would be hilling up the cotton plants from which the delicate flower had fallen, leaving a white bud to swell.

"My health and my strength are as good as I could expect at my time of life." . . . He was sixty-seven, closer to the allotted three-score and ten than a man of his frail physique might expect to live; and as he had drawn the sting of life in consecrating his hours by vigorous effort, so he would draw the sting of death by walking with nature whose paths were peace. He had never been a gregarious man, the genius in

him propelling him towards isolation as his gentlemanly traits did towards privacy; but it was satisfying to have friendly neighbours calling, inquiring about his health, bringing gifts of fruit and flowers – simple folk, these South Carolina agrarians, soft of speech, gentle of manner, sunny of temper, nurtured by a climate that required no rigidly ascetic discipline to cultivate and enjoy the fruits of the rich earth. He knew them for what they were worth; men of courtesy, frankness and ease, whose sensitive self-respect sometimes led them to hauteur; sometimes narrow but seldom malicious. "Indolent," active men of the North called them, because they found time to loll on their piazzas for hours over a smoke or a drink, or spend days in the fields and by the streams; but was there not a dignity in their spiritual attitude towards those things that mocked time? Surely they required no feverish activity to make time endurable! Were these men disunionists and traitors because they wanted to be let alone? But since no peace was ever won from fate by subterfuge or agreement, when the time came they would not mistake oppression for peace!

"I devote all the time left me to finishing the work I commenced three years ago, but which I have had to suspend the past two years. I finished yesterday the preliminary work which treats of the elementary principles of the Science of Government. . . It will be new territory nearly throughout, and I hope lay a solid foundation for political science. I have written just as I thought, and told the truth without fear, favour or affection." . . . Though peace ruled the day, reason ruled the mind. The limitations of his physical life were closing about him darkly; for that very reason the deeper was his comprehension of the Evening Star. What would Calhoun's great intellect have been had outside discipline been applied before his matured mind was moulded? In an environment congenial to humanistic thought – instead of a period made barren by the sterility of lawyer-thought – would his mind have lost its rigidity and become pliable from con-

tact with diverse streams of theory? These are interesting speculations (for great minds react on the society which has made them what they are) in recreating a man; but the original creation would not have been a *Calhoun*. "I wish to become more Southern," he had said. "The reward is in the struggle more than in victory." Only thus could his great mind repay with interest what he had received from society.

II

HORACE GREELEY wrote, reporting the Taylor inauguration ball: "Let those who will flatter the chief dispenser of executive patronage, and discover in every act and feature some resemblance to Washington: I am content to wait and watch and hope. . . I turn from this imposing pageant, so rich in glitter, so poor in feeling, to thought of *him* who should have been the central figure of this grand panorama — the distant, the powerless, the unforgotten — 'behind the mountains but not setting' — the eloquent champion of liberty in both hemispheres — whose voice thrilled the hearts of the uprisings, the long-tramped sons of Leonidas and Xenophon — whose appeals for South American *independence* were read to the hastily mustered squadrons of Bolivar and nerved them to sweep from this fair Continent the myrmidons of Spanish oppression. My heart is with him in his far South hiding-place — with him, the early advocate of *African emancipation*; the lifelong champion of a *diversified home industry*; of internal improvement, and not less glorious in his later years as the stern reprover of the fatal spirit of *conquest and aggression*. Let exulting thousands quaff their red wines at the revel of the victor of Monterey and Buena Vista, while wit points the sentiment with an epigram and beauty crowns it with her smiles: more grateful to me the stillness of my lonely chamber, this cup of crystal *water* in which I honour a cherished memory with this old familiar aspiration: 'Here's to you, Harry Clay!'"

Taylor's election—a repudiation of the preceding administration that had settled the great Texas and Oregon questions!—was purely a reactionary comeback, and there was nothing to do but underwrite Polk's administration. The tariff was working and the bank a sleeping dog. The agreement with Great Britain not to acquire further interests in South America rather blocked Polk's plans for a Panama Canal; but that was not a pressing political issue. The only question left to be settled was the Southwest: the Oregon question having been settled, the Northwest was expanding rapidly; if the South was to expand in proportion the Southwest question must be settled. But that involved the burning issue of slavery.

The administration temporarily escaped the imbroglio through the discovery of gold in California which was followed by the gold-rush, the first non-agrarian exodus in America and a movement such as the world had never before witnessed. Nationalism, which through wealth is soon inflated into imperialism, had here both its food and its stature. Gold-dust *was* capital; prospecting for it was elemental speculation; therefore a capitalistic system was imposed upon California by *nature* without any theorizing. As for stature, the new territory—Oregon, California, New Mexico and Utah—was big enough to satisfy the most imperialistic craving.

Inventive ingenuity was rising to meet the rapid growth of capitalism and territory with typical energy and resourcefulness. Requests for patents leapt to a thousand in a single year as compared to a few hundred in the past several years. Thirty thousand miles of railroad had been laid or was being laid in the North and West: a great transcontinental railway was no longer a dream but a probability. A reciprocity treaty with Great Britain and the future treaty of Perry with Japan would stimulate foreign trade, especially the importation of tea from the Orient. Fast clipper ships running up to five thousand tons, designed for speed rather than size, were

to become the Yankee pride. The *Honqua* made the trip from Shanghai to New York in eighty-eight days. The *Oriental* excited London by her beauty and speed. The *Rainbow* and the *Sea Witch* were names familiar even to the man of the field and of the street. The *Flying Cloud* and the *Jackson*, serving the gold-rush, made the trip around the Cape in eighty-eight days. Shipbuilders were experimenting with screw-driven steamers and iron hulls. The minor intellectuals and the current newspapers and magazines were enthusiastically giving the rapid progress of the nation its intellection.

The last of the year the Californians held a convention, drew up a constitution prohibiting slavery, and applied to Congress for admission to the Union as a free State. Their action made a decision in regard to the disposal of the Mexican territory no longer avoidable. Texas, making claim to half of New Mexico, had already been warned that an army would be sent against her if she attempted to establish her line beyond the boundary of the old Spanish province. President Polk had insisted that since California extended far south of the Missouri Compromise line, the State must be divided according to the law; but President Taylor, a better soldier than political leader, already tottering on the verge of the grave at sixty-six, decided to hurry California and New Mexico into the Union as free- or slave-States according to the determination of the people themselves before the issue became a shuttle-cock in politics like Oregon. . .

THE "Last Congress" of a united country met on December 3, 1849, in a bitterly factional spirit, sixty-three ballots being necessary to elect a Speaker. For the first time the representatives of the Union met not as members of different parties working for particular interests and ideas, but as delegates of two distinct nations. Party lines were drawn only as a matter of form but politically they meant nothing, having reached that stage where, coloured by the mass-sentiment of

the opposing sections, all parties of the North were united against all parties of the South on the question of slavery. Just as that institution had divided the Union socially and then economically, so now it had divided the country politically. One other stage – the moral – remained to make the division complete and a conflict inevitable.

Clay, returning to the Senate at seventy-three; Benton, still in the Senate though not re-elected; Webster, from whose control the new factional party was fast slipping; Calhoun, who, though he had proved the inviolability of State sovereignty, was still manœuvring to keep the Union functioning through the South's control of the Democratic Party – all watched the new trend of affairs with dismay. Old-fashioned Southern Whigs such as Robert Toombs and Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia, and old-fashioned Northern Democrats such as Stephen Douglas and Lewis Cass, were still inclined to compromise; but the fiery members from South Carolina and Mississippi, and the Northern exponents of the "Higher Law" were equally determined upon a show-down.

Jefferson Davis of Mississippi, regarded as Calhoun's successor, had left his State convinced that his people would secede if California was admitted as a free-State; and he believed (and was doubtless right) that if such an ultimatum was delivered the Northern radicals would yield. Thus he differed from his great mentor as to means; and the end they both sought was still not yet clearly enough defined to warrant unqualified acceptance or rejection. . .

FROM Jefferson to Calhoun to Davis was a long way, and yet it was infinitesimal since the way was infinite – the art of democracy, like that of nations, being cumulative and never ceasing to develop and live through men. All three men were frontier Democrats, Davis having been born in Kentucky a few miles from the birthplace of Abraham Lincoln. Jefferson had fought against Southern "interests," Calhoun and Davis were fighting for them; yet all three were fighting

for the same thing in liberty – Jefferson for that liberty which the interests were depriving the people of, Calhoun and Davis for that which the interests were now being deprived of. Jefferson had been born in affluent circumstances and yet had remained a homespun aristocrat; Calhoun and Davis, born in poorer circumstances, had both made themselves into real aristocrats – Calhoun only in spirit (for he maintained a far simpler standard of living than even Jefferson), Davis not only in spirit but in grandeur of manners and living.

After his retirement from the army Davis had removed to Mississippi (where his brother had become wealthy) and established himself as a gentleman-planter. On the death of his first wife, the daughter of General Taylor, he had married the aristocratic Varina Howell; and both in Mississippi and at Washington their home was the acme of abundance, hospitality and elegance, and the centre of gaiety and wit. Tall and slender – Carl Schurz, remarking Davis's height, declared that in "every inch he was an aristocrat" – he always carried himself like a soldier; and though he invariably rode in his private carriage to the President's House or to his office at the Capitol (the work on which was to be completed under his supervision after an enlarged plan "which in its massive proportions and graceful, sweeping lines, represents the dignity and stability of the country, and the continuity and permanence through years of the principles laid down by Washington"), afternoon always found him on his saddle-horse on his daily ride to and from Cabin John's Bridge. But nerves, no less than heart, make a gentleman; and the chronic indigestion and neuralgia from which Davis suffered (often he rose from his sick-bed to attend to his duties) gave him, in mastering the disability, a sensitivity and extraordinary sympathy which showed itself no less in his exquisite manners and courtesy than in his wide grey eyes and mobile, irregular features, and the prominent brow expressing strength of will and imperious determination. Calhoun, an intellectual aristocrat, always retained instinctive traces of the middle class; Davis

none at all. And yet it was Calhoun's limitation, his temperamental removal from the aristocracy, that gave him the objectivity which enabled him to use his intellectual endowment to articulate its aspirations; whereas Davis without that perspective took the aristocracy for granted without apologetics.

In politics Davis was the more practical, if less logical. Like the other younger leaders of his generation he saw clearly that logic was of no avail with the North; that an exploited minority reverting to constitutional argument (the surest of which was the sovereignty of the States) was combating by mere theory the selfish ends for which power was being used; and he had little faith in the virtue of compromise which he thought should be used practically as the North did – merely to gain time. Moreover, he realized that the union of the South and West to balance sectional power was a thing of the past: empire was a reality, therefore nationalism (upon which empire was based) was a reality – not the agrarian nationalism Jefferson had accepted as more or less established upon the principle of democracy and the numerical majority of the people as the primal source of political power for the benefit of themselves, but an industrial nationalism based upon equality and group-help which must sooner or later give the Union its polity, converting the Union by federalized control into a nation serving primarily the interests of a new materialistic ruling class. So Davis, first offering a sop to the Northwest by advocating in the *Congressional Globe* the seizure of Yucatan lest Great Britain take it, turned his attention to progressive measures for developing the South: a Southern Pacific railroad from Memphis to the Coast; a Panama Canal opening the markets of Japan and China to the South; the purchase of Cuba; and finally closer relations between the whole South and South Carolina (the latter being the focal point of Southern doctrine). A great convention was projected for the following June at Nashville, Tennessee, to articulate the program in detail. In the meantime, Mississippi

and South Carolina must take the initiative in preventing any State being brought into the Union unless slavery was recognized, in order to solidify the South on the issue and prevent the diminution of her power. The more the South demanded the further she would be met in compromise. Thus Davis and the younger Southern leaders were opposing the older men upon the *principle* of compromise, not upon what it was meant to accomplish. Such a spirit could be extended even to personalities: though detesting Abolitionists and abhorring the reformers' "Higher Law" doctrines, Davis's closest friend at the Capital was none other than the opinionated William H. Seward of New York.

Calhoun, who regarded compromise as a right principle in a democracy, was thus at variance with his younger colleagues in principle while he agreed with them as to ends; and at the same time was closer to his old opponents, Clay and Benton and Webster, in principle while he was at complete variance with them as to ends. He knew that the South was unable to change her agrarian life even if she had wanted to (which she did not). Thus her only safety lay in complete independence; the power of that independence lay in the extension of Southern territory; the unity of that territory lay in the slave-holding privilege. So far he would go, for this was the right given the South by the Constitution. But expediencies such as his younger colleagues were inclined to embrace were to him unmoral; while the points of the compromise which Clay and Benton and Webster were advocating were clearly unconstitutional. Either way was equally dangerous for the South. . .

THE anti-slavery group, led by the able William H. Seward, included such diverse types as Thaddeus Stevens, Representative from Pennsylvania, and Salmon P. Chase, Senator from Ohio. Stevens, a cripple born in squalid surroundings in Vermont, was animated by conflicting motives: an instinctive sympathy for the underdog, and a desire to visit upon others

the abuse he had been subjected to in early life. Chase, a native of New Hampshire who had gone to live with an uncle, a pioneer bishop in Ohio, was a humourless, opinionated reformer of the intellectual type. Determined not to make the mistake that had ruined their predecessors, the Federalists, this group was now coming out staunchly for empire, even offering to buy Cuba from Spain. But they were equally determined that the new empire must be free and industrial; and to accomplish that, they foresaw that they must eliminate every institution antagonistic to nationalism and capitalism. On their side was the influence of untouched natural resources, the rapid rise of the nationalistic and materialistic middle class, the intellection of the New England transcendentalists, the agitations of the Abolitionists. Adams was dead, Webster and Clay ready to die; but such conservative Unionists would have been brushed aside anyhow for the younger radicals such as Lincoln and Sumner. This was the wing of the Whig-Republicans, soon to emerge as the Republican Party, which President Taylor, after some hesitation, took into his confidence and made Seward his spokesman.

But Clay and Webster still enjoyed the confidence of the country more than Seward; and now, feeling that the Union was really in danger, they sought to compromise. Clay could not discard his lifelong habit of assuming leadership; but for once Webster was willing to follow.

The "Compromise Incarnate" spoke several days despite the fact that he was ill and haggard and frequently had to stop to rest. Clay was old; but if his long upper lip was now like a withered oak leaf, and his square chin less firm than of yore, his spirit was still sturdy, and his eyes, set under their colourless brows in a wide forehead, full of the old-time fire. No one could doubt the intense patriotism of this slave-holding son of a Baptist minister who had aspired but never arrived at being the President of the United States . . . or even at being "Mr. Clay of *Ashlands*." He could see (so spoke Clay) no

safety for the country save in a union of hearts which must be brought about by mutual concessions. The issue was one of sentiment on the part of Northerners, but of interest on the part of Southerners. Sentiment, he thought, could be more easily overcome than interest; therefore in the bargain the North must concede more than the South. His compromise scheme included the simultaneous settlement of eight questions: the admission of California as a free State; the organization of Utah and New Mexico without any reference to slavery; the claims of Texas to be settled by a money payment; the retention of slavery in the District of Columbia; the abolition of the slave trade; an affirmation that Congress had no power over the inter-State slave trade; and the passage of a workable fugitive-slave law. Calhoun, feeble and emaciated, sat wrapped in a heavy shawl listening grimly to his old adversary setting forth the terms of a *compromise* on issues upon which the law already spoke concisely. But he criticized only the text; he approved Clay's purpose.

On Monday, March 4, Calhoun made his way to the Senate chamber supported by his friend James Hamilton. In that great forum, set not with tapestry and tinsel but with the higher colouring of a mighty history; where a great host of heroes had followed one another in solemn procession to teach the world the difficult task of how to carry on a popular government, pouring out in winged words of appeal and passion, or cogent and earnest argument, the genius that had forged the American Union . . . a new party was taking possession to challenge that Union, flinging down the gauntlet for mortal combat by which it might expect to bring into existence a nation of less heroic proportions. Calhoun no longer had any hope of saving the Union but only in those phases of comity which would prevent Southern resistance for their social security; no hope for the South itself, though like the Old Roman he was he would keep up the fight that it might be said of him also, "Vitrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni!"

During the reading of his speech by his friend James Murray Mason of Virginia – he was too feeble to deliver it himself – Calhoun sat wrapped in his shawl, his eyes roving over the audience to note its effect, occasionally imparting emphasis by significant gestures of his own. Webster and Clay sat like rigid statues.

"I have, Senators," began Calhoun's dying message in Mason's ringing tones, "believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion." Examining the source of this danger, he found it in the discontent of the South, and this was due to the agitation of slavery and the destruction of the equilibrium between the sections. The loss of power had resulted in the South's exclusion in the territories by the Ordinance of 1787, in the Missouri Compromise, and the Oregon bill; and in the greater amount of federal money appropriated for the North. There had also been such a growth of centralization that the central Government claimed and practically exercised the right to decide on the *extent of its own powers*, so that in any dispute, even in the relations between the two races in the South, the latter's interests would always be sacrificed.

"Every part of the North has today feelings hostile to slavery," he went on; and traced the growth of the agitation against it as he had done so many times in the past. "What can stop this growth and the dire results? Nothing, as matters now are. And the South will certainly be forced by the continued increase of opposition to slavery to choose between abolition and disunion." That the Government might buy the slaves and then free them, as the British Government had done, was a solution to which the radical anti-slavery party would never have acceded; and therefore Calhoun did not even mention it. "Disunion . . . will come, not suddenly but gradually. *It has already begun!* . . . It is a mistake to suppose that disunion can be effected by a single blow. The cords which bound these States together in one common

Union are far too numerous and powerful for that. Disunion must be the work of time. It is only through a long process, and successively, that the cords can be snapped until the whole fabric falls asunder. Already the agitation of slavery has snapped the most important. . .

"The cords that bound the States together are not only many but various in character. Some are spiritual or ecclesiastical; some political; some social. Some appertain to the benefit conferred by the Union; others to the feeling of duty and obligation.

"The strongest of those of a spiritual and ecclesiastical nature consisted in the unity of the great religious denominations, all of which originally embraced the whole Union. All these denominations, with the exception perhaps of the Catholic, were organized very much upon the principle of our political institutions . . . and these combined contributed greatly to strengthen the bonds of the Union. The ties which held each denomination together formed a strong cord to hold the whole Union together; but powerful as they were, they have not been able to resist the explosive effect of slavery agitation. The first of these cords which snapped under its explosive force was that of the powerful Methodist Episcopal Church. The numerous and strong ties which held it together are all broken and its unity gone. They now form separate churches; and instead of that feeling of attachment and devotion to the interests of the whole church which was formerly felt, they are now arrayed in two hostile bodies, engaged in litigation about what was formerly their common property. The next cord that snapped was that of the Baptists — one of the largest and most respectable of the denominations. That of the Presbyterians is not entirely snapped but some of its strands have given way. That of the Episcopal Church is the only one of the four great Protestant bodies which remains unbroken and entire.

"The strongest cord of a political character consists of the many and powerful ties that have held together the two great

parties which have existed from the beginning of the Government. They both extended to every portion of the Union and strongly contributed to holding all its parts together. But this powerful cord has fared no better than the spiritual. It resisted for a long time the explosive force – if not entirely, in a great measure.

"Nor is there one of the remaining cords which has not been greatly weakened. To this extent the Union has already been destroyed by agitation, in the only way it could be, by sundering and weakening the cords which bound it together. If the agitation goes on, the same force acting with increasing intensity will finally snap every cord when nothing will be left to hold the States together *except force!*

"How, then, can the Union be saved? In no way but by removing the cause of the trouble; by satisfying the Southern States that they can remain in safety. The cry of 'Union, Union, the glorious Union!' can do nothing to help in the matter, nor can the invocation of 'the name of the illustrious Southerner whose mortal remains repose on the western bank of the Potomac.' He was one of us – a slave-holder and a planter. We have studied his history, and find nothing in it to justify submission to wrong. Nor can we find anything in his history to deter us from seceding from the Union should it fail to fulfill the objects for which it was instituted, by being permanently and hopelessly converted into the means of oppressing instead of protecting us. On the contrary, we find much in his example to encourage us, should we be forced to the extremity of deciding between submission and disunion.

"There existed then, as well as now, a union: that between the parent-country and her then colonies. It was a union that had much to endear it to the people of the colonies. . . Washington was born and grew to manhood under that union. He acquired his early distinction in its service, and there is every reason to believe he was devotedly attached to it. But his devotion was a rational one. He was attached to it not as an end but as a means to an end. When it failed

to fulfill its end, and instead of affording protection was converted into the means of oppressing the colonists, he did not hesitate to draw his sword and head the great movement by which that union was forever severed and the independence of these States established. This was the great and crowning glory of his life, which has spread his fame over the whole globe and will transmit it to the latest posterity!"

As to plans, Calhoun had none to put forward. The South was doomed unless it should have equal rights in the newly acquired districts. He had no desire for local option, and regarded the action of the Californians as a piece of gross impertinence: the admission of a State on their terms would be the equivalent of a notice that the North meant to overwhelm the South. He thought that neither the plan of the Senator from Kentucky (Clay) nor that of the administration could save the Union. Indeed the latter, the "Executive Proviso," was more objectionable than the Wilmot Proviso, maintaining as it did the right of the inhabitants of each territory to regulate the subject of slavery. There was only one way in which the Union could be saved: the restoration of the harmony and fraternal feelings between the two sections which had existed anterior to the Missouri agitation.

"But can this be done? Yes, easily. . . The North has only to will it in order to accomplish it — to do justice by conceding to the South equal rights in the acquired territory, and to do her duty by causing the stipulations relative to fugitive slaves to be faithfully fulfilled — to cease the agitation of the slave question, and to provide for the insertion of a provision in the Constitution by an amendment which will restore to the South in substance the power she possessed of protecting herself before the equilibrium between the sections was destroyed by the action of this Government. There will be no difficulty in devising such a provision — one that will protect the South and, at the same time will improve and strengthen the Government. . . If you who represent the stronger portion cannot agree to settle them on the broad principle of

justice and duty, say so, and let the States we both represent agree to separate and part in peace. If you are unwilling we should part in peace, tell us so, and we shall know what to do when you reduce the question to submission or resistance. . .

"I have now, Senators, done my duty in expressing my opinions fully, freely and candidly on this solemn occasion. In doing so I have been governed by the motives which have governed me in all the stages of the agitation of the slavery question since its commencement. I have exerted myself during the whole period to arrest it with the intention of saving the Union if it could be done; and if it could not be, to save the section where it has pleased Providence to cast my lot, and which I sincerely believe has justice and the Constitution on its side. Having faithfully done my duty to the best of my ability, both to the Union and to my section, throughout this agitation, I shall have the consolation, let what come will, that I am free from all responsibility."

Three days later Daniel Webster made the third great speech on the Compromise. The Senator from Massachusetts was now sixty-eight, the same age as Calhoun and Benton. But time had not treated him so cruelly as it had Calhoun: his body, though gross, was not twisted with disease; his hair, though gray, was not snow-white; and his eyes were as lustrous, his voice as richly musical, as they had been in his youth. Always a majestic figure, age had given Webster a poetic quality to compensate for the marks of genius which he lacked. Always an opportunist, he had never been a reformer; and his respect for private property extended to the South as well as the North. At last cured of his earlier ambition, he could see that on the slope he was descending the eminences were moral rather than worldly greatnesses; and not only was he able to express his convictions without fear of hurting his career, but to welcome the opportunity to complete his stature by catastrophe if need be for the sake of preserving the peace of his country. So, disregarding the sectionalism that had once actuated him, he

declared, as he had promised Clay, unequivocably for the Compromise. Why agitate the question of slavery in New Mexico? Slavery was excluded by nature from those regions; there was no occasion to put in a Wilmot Proviso as a taunt and a reproach to the South. That was to continue the controversy on a mere abstraction. Moreover, most of the clamour about the reclamation of slaves came from quarters where no reclaims had ever been made — in fact, few were ever made anywhere. He for one would not lend himself to mere fanaticism.

Calhoun tottered into the chamber unobserved as Webster was speaking of him. When Webster espied him, the great orator expressed his pleasure at seeing Calhoun in the hall; but went on to criticize, yet kindly enough, the latter's course as to Texas. Calhoun interrupted once to explain a point, and later, to refer to their long friendship and the lances they had broken together, adding, "I have no desire to do it now." "I presume the gentleman has not," answered Webster, "and I have quite as little."

Calhoun was again present on the 11th when Seward made the fourth speech. Decidedly the new type of man, Seward had neglected no opportunity to be *au courrant:* he had studied law, espoused the Unionist cause, defended the bank, supported John Quincy Adams, cultivated Thurlow Weed, advocated Greek independence, supported canal and railroad construction, defended "freedom" of the press (Greeley style), vindicated tolerance for Roman Catholics (when Protestantism was become too emasculated to persecute), preserved silence on slavery when Northern interests demanded (it was said he himself owned slaves), lauded the Irish and Hungarian republicans, attacked slavery violently when Northern interests demanded it, and supported General Taylor (who was now completely under his influence). Mentally somewhat idiosyncratic, temperamentally vain and excessively optimistic, intellectually so appropriative that he hardly recognized the distinctions of plagiarism, no better

spokesman could have been found to announce their platform to his fellow reformers – Chase, Sumner, Giddings, Garrison, Wade and Stevens – two years before: *Slavery can be limited to its present bounds; it can be ameliorated; it can and must be abolished, and you and I must do it!*

Now with one sweep he cast aside historical subtleties and constitutional precedents and declared: "There is a *higher law* than the Constitution which regulates our authority over the domain and devotes it to the same noble purpose – to Union, to Justice, to Defence, to Liberty!"

Calhoun listened intently to what seemed to him anarchy; but Webster constantly interrupted to demand if he had heard aright, settling back each time with a sneer of contempt on his lips. There was nothing novel, they knew, in the *Higher Law:* it was the old red flag that had always been raised whenever vested rights were to be extinguished, the vainglorious substitute for the vital honour of a nation. Two decades before Lord Brougham had raised the same cry in the House of Commons in advocating the abolition of the slave trade in the West Indies. "Tell me not of rights, talk not of the property of the planter in his slaves! I deny the right – I acknowledge not the property! The feelings of our common nature rise in rebellion against it. Be the appeal made to the understanding or to the heart, the sentence is the same that rejects it. In vain you tell me of the laws that sanction such a claim! There is a *law above* all the enactments of human codes – the same throughout the world, the same in all times – such as it was before the daring of Columbus pierced the night of ages and opened to one world the source of power and wealth and knowledge; to another all unutterable woes. Such it is at this day. It is the law written on the heart of man by the finger of God; and by that law, unchangeable and eternal while men despise fraud and loath rapine and abhor blood, they will reject with indignation the wild and guilty phantasy that man can hold property in man!"

Now that the doctrine had been revealed, Chase as the next missioner made the concluding emotional appeal for conversion. "Shall ye yield to this outcry? For one I say *Never!* In my judgment it is time to pause. We have yielded point after point; we have crowded concession on concession until duty, honour, patriotism, shame, demand that we should stop. . . Let us understand each other. Let us cease from endeavouring to agree in the support of the same candidate upon opposite grounds. . . Least of all does the stale cry of disunion alarm me. . . It may be, however, that you will succeed here in sacrificing the claims of freedom by some settlement carried through the forms of legislation. But the people will unsettle your settlement. It may be that you will determine that the territories shall not be secured by law against the ingress of slavery. But the people will reverse your determination. It may be that you will succeed in burying the Ordinance of Freedom. But the people will write upon its tomb *Resurgam!* And the same history which records its resurrection may also inform posterity that they who fancied they had killed the Proviso only committed political suicide!"

Declared Jefferson Davis: "I hereby assert that I will never take less than the Missouri Compromise line extended to the ocean, with the specific recognition of the right to hold slaves below that line; and that before such territories are admitted as States slaves may be taken there from any of the United States at the option of their owners." . .

DESPITE the opposition of President Taylor the compromise passed. The extreme members of each nation were furious, especially the anti-slavery element. "A hollow bargain for the North," Garrison called it. Webster was especially excoriated. "Weak, base and infamous," Garrison described him; and Whittier poetically referred to him as Ichabod and mourned for him as one dead. But the conservative elements

everywhere breathed a sigh of relief at the reprieve. Clay and Webster had merely postponed interstate war, but to the contemporaries they had averted it. In the North, Webster became the "godlike." Clay was acclaimed without canonization. The large cities in the North and Northwest celebrated the "Great Congress" with fire and cannon. Southern Unionists also proceeded to fall in line: Benton and Houston openly repudiated any policy the logic of which was disunion. Stephens defended the compromise as a blessing in disguise, since it would automatically repeal the Missouri Compromise and open all territories to slavery. Toombs, who had thrown the full force of his outstanding oratory on Clay's side, made it plain that should the compromise fail he would support secession as the only alternative. Henry S. Foote, the colleague of Jefferson Davis, declared that the latter did not represent the feelings of his Mississippi constituency; and when Davis suggested that both of them resign and test the issue by re-election, it was the secessionist Davis who was defeated and returned to his plantation.

Mellowed by compromise, most of the young Southerners were turning away from Calhoun—not because they repudiated him but because they feared being forced to quit public life by the popular conservative reaction, an eventuality it was too late to evade as Calhoun could have told them. Where now was the leader, to whom a prophet is a prophet whether of glory or disaster, who would thrill to the old South Carolinian's call? As a last straw, on entering the Senate he had heard the fiery young Foote bitterly assailing him as a disunionist. Now indeed the great Calhoun stood alone—an anachronistic Colossus gazing upon the Vaults of the Dead.

"Disunionist? Did he call me that?" he demanded brokenly.

Foote, a little ashamed, spoke of the necessity of being on good terms with the other Senators. But Calhoun answered: "I am not. I will not be on good terms with those who wish

to cut my throat. The honourable Senator from New York (Seward) justifies Northern treachery. I am not the man to hold social intercourse with such as these."

"I think Seward will have to be given up," conceded Foote.

"I recognize them as Senators," pursued Calhoun, "say good morning and shake hands with them, but that is the extent of my intercourse with those who I think are endangering the Union."

It was the last thing he was to say in the Senate. His very last word was *Union.*

So died the spirit of compromise with Calhoun, Clay, Webster and Benton, in the last congress of the Union. Sumner was right when he declared that the compromise annulled all past compromises with slavery and made all future compromises impossible, "thus putting freedom and slavery face to face and bidding them grapple." Henceforth the self-styled "Warriors of the Right" with their slogan *Freedom is national, Slavery is sectional!* would comprise the Unofficial Congress of Higher Laws, increasingly wielding the "moral power by which the Prophets and Apostles subdued the Kingdom and wrought righteousness!"

III

After his last visit to the Senate Chamber, Calhoun returned to his home at Hill's Mess, the building which had been occupied by Congress after the destruction of the Capitol in the War of 1812 and which was known as the Old Capitol. He was extremely feeble, but he took pains to write his family, lest they worry, that his health continued to improve. He faded slowly, and was able to see people and talk with them about public affairs and work on his "Discourse on the Constitution and Government of the United States." Near the end of March he had an interview with Toombs whom he told he would not live the session out, and that he must leave

to the younger men the task of carrying out his views. Once he complained that he had given so much of his mind to debate that now when he was so old and not able to debate he could think of nothing else. Dark forebodings and fears for the Union were constantly in his thoughts.

Once, when Mason was sitting with him discussing slavery, Calhoun said: "The Union is doomed to dissolution; there is no mistaking the signs. I am satisfied in my judgment even were the questions which now agitate Congress settled to the satisfaction and with the concurrence of the Southern States, it would not avert or even materially delay the catastrophe. I fix its probable occurrence within twelve years or three presidential terms. You and others of your age will probably live to see it. The mode by which it will be done is not so clear. It may be brought about in a manner that none now foresee. But the probability is that it will explode in a presidential election."

Throughout March he was much worse and had to abandon any plan of returning home. He refused to send for his wife because of the "inconvenience" it would cause her, and the duties of caring for the sick-chamber devolved upon his faithful clerk, Crallé. On the night of Saturday, March 30, he asked the clerk to read him a part of his *Discourse*. He seemed not to know that death was so near, for when Crallé made an excuse for stopping at eleven o'clock Calhoun merely said, "Well, read me the rest tomorrow." After midnight, however, he began to breathe with difficulty, and telling his son he was sinking rapidly bade him lock up the manuscript.

In the morning he seemed better. "If I had my health and strength to devote one hour to my country in the Senate I could do more than in my whole life," he murmured. At five o'clock his son asked him how he felt. "I am perfectly comfortable," he said distinctly.

They were his last words. An hour later he made a motion for his son to come near him, but he could not articulate. He took all his friends there by the hand. They saw the

final curtain creeping, like a transparent grey veil, from his neck to his forehead.

Once again he made an effort to speak . . . and a surprised, almost a hurt look dawned in his dark eyes as if he had just realized that this beloved human faculty was finally gone. The play being over, the lowered curtain obscured the suffering in his pain-racked features, leaving to view only the unreality of its painted and artificial scene of joyous life. . .

His life was a perfect tragedy in that it had not the moral defect of giving too much importance to life and death: without blood to agitate the mind or events to compel the tears, and so furnish that pleasure which stifles humanity in the spectator. Such a tragedy as *Calhoun* quickens no pulse, creates no heroes, and wins no plaudits from whomever is inclined to accept the easy opinion that the cause which triumphs is the better cause; and he who bent all his mental powers, moral energy, and force of an iron will to the service of a doomed cause must rest in the common grave of lost faiths and repudiated prophets, warming the soul and elevating the heart only of that spectator who is content to learn from the dead.

POSTSCRIPT

And the Lord said, Behold the people is one; and they all have one language; and this they begin to do.

Genesis

I

"The Union—next to our liberties the most dear! May we all remember that it can only be preserved by respecting the rights of the States and distributing equally the benefit and burthen of the Union."

DURING Calhoun's lifetime the South had remained constant to the conception of the Government as a federal Union, whereas the North, due to new economic conditions there, had come to regard the Government as a national Union. To impose national industrialism upon the Union it was necessary to destroy the old South. To destroy the South it was necessary to render her ruling class economically decadent by destroying their property (slaves), and to destroy their property it was necessary to change the law and amend the Constitution. This could be done only by force—in a democracy, the force of a numerical majority. But since men will not confess to self-interest as a reason for force, the Puritan rationalization of *Absolute Good* was conveniently resorted to for justification.

Against this perversion of democracy and prostitution of liberty Calhoun set his face. The revelation of his doctrines was not immediate but progressive, mediacy always being a human limitation; but the fundamental American principles underlying them remained unchanged as he grew in knowledge of their meaning and in the modes of their application. His *Disquisition on Government,* written towards the close of his life, is, therefore, merely a convenient summary of the doctrines he progressively advocated throughout his whole political career. . .

LIKE the Tower of Babel, Calhoun saw the Union cursed with the confusion of tongues, that modern form of race-prejudice transposed by economic madness called nationalism. He saw the national honour for which his generation had fought being brazenly replaced by the new national interest, the logic of union or disunion being flippantly quoted for conveniently seizing the national power. Calhoun loved the Union – but next to his liberty. With Milton he was ready to say, "Where liberty dwells, there is my country." But liberty to him meant the privilege of enjoying his own rights, not of destroying those of others. Without this spirit talk of union was mere cant.

When, therefore, the younger men in whose hands lay the destiny of the country declared in substance that God had created the United States one by the same language, the same history, and the same boundaries, and what God had joined together no man had the right to put asunder, Calhoun in substance replied that God's only Kingdom was composed of all nations and races with only the boundary of the blue sky; and that it was His Word that had labelled any other sort or kind as accursed. If language was the limitation of the nation, then did not the North and South speak, by a different connotation of words like *democracy* and *liberty*, another political language? And if people were reasonably kept apart by great seas and rivers and mountain ranges, then were not those peoples who remained separated without those natural barriers all the more divided? If it was economic and social unity that determined the autonomy of a state, then had not the North and South always been separate nations? America had always bespoken the liberty of the small restricted state: surely the South was as solid a country, geographically and culturally, as any independent nation in Europe or South America.

But apparently the principles of reason and justice were not to prevail against the affirmations of "civilization" and "progress" and "union." Calhoun never disputed the fact of

progress; but he did deny that it was whatever distrusted logic and authority. He well knew that ordinary human progress in material civilization depended upon man's creative skill and constructive ability and industry (which qualities had never been brought to greater importance than in his era wherein the masses were arming themselves to play an unprecedented part); but he did deny that men of reason and patriotism should stand aside while the movement automatically ran its gamut of ignorance, passion, greed, chaotic "conservatism," and tyranny, whilst reformers cried: "Man is rational; therefore his institutions are rational!"

Calhoun clearly saw that the new scientific and inductive spirit initiated by John Locke as giving observation and experiment a prestige equal to that of mechanical physics, should be strictly limited to the mechanics: that in the spiritual, moral and institutional life of man, fields in which experimentation are impossible, the inductive aspect of Newton's thought would always be inapplicable. The weakness of science was that it must always be *sure:* hence the ineptitude of science (as of individual scientists) in facing realities. Politics, which dealt with the uncertain ebb and flow of human activity, was thus more of a reality than industrial progress based upon experimental science and invention. Political unity must be achieved before economic unity lest the masses, following their natural egotistical tendency to experiment with their own opinions instead of accepting the ideas of leaders, hurriedly discard political unity for economic materialism, and substitute for union a makeshift and standardized nationalism. When nationalism reached the saturation point, then only bureaucratic socialism could save the country; when socialism overflowed the national boundaries, then only international communism could save the world. Thus it was necessary to leash in its infancy a nationalism based upon materialism rather than political unity.

This Calhoun thought could be done by the creation of a society in which men were held individually answerable for

their acts, and State ownership of certain public utilities, thus insuring the perpetuation of common honesty and preventing unchecked individualism based on greed. Within State limits, corporation power would then be restrained even if that prevented its immediate effectiveness. Otherwise, without any limitation, gigantic corporations and combines (when the mistakes of ruinous competition were apprehended, pools and mergers would be resorted to for remedying the mistakes) would operate with the same degree of freedom as a one-man concern; and since every such combination must have a head, that head could operate without the least risk. Railroads as well as other corporations would be viewed by their promoters merely as a mechanism of high finance, a sort of gambling device for mulcting the public for the benefit of inside speculators and investors, rather than as public service. Such was unchecked individualism, sponsored by the national industrial party of Clay and Webster, which the American people would one day come to realize was little more than organized criminality.

Culturally the harm would be even greater, for already the new men were justifying their course by rationalistic intellection. Sir Charles Lyell's *Principles of Geology*, contending that the observation of geological processes over an incalculable time would explain the manner and time in which the earth had assumed its present physical appearance, had been supplemented by the German naturalist von Humboldt's *Cosmos* in which this friend of Jefferson had harmonized all the scientific accomplishments from the Eighteenth Century to the present in order to demonstrate the supreme *unity* in all details of nature. Nature, ran the theme, was an universal system in which man was included. If nature was rational, man was rational. Therefore, whatever in human society seemed reasonable was natural, and conversely whatever was natural was reasonable. Such a theory was bound to find immediate acceptance with the Puritan disposition to reconcile opposing truths; but as a basis of education it was certain to

train a nation of half-educated pseudo-scientists determined to reconcile religion, the State and science; make common education the "star" to which the democratic wagon should be hitched, and end by teaching sheer ignorance – ignorance being the "natural" thing for any child to want.

So far as true progress involved reform, Calhoun believed that the latter could be best secured by progressing towards conservatism – back to the workable and liberal system which the fathers founded not upon a centralized bureaucracy but upon democracy and faith in the common man. Democracy rather than nationalism; individual liberty rather than plutocratic individualism; the Constitution rather than legalism; and last – and this was the central theme of all his doctrines – the rights of minorities rather than a centralized tyranny. To him a local self-government, the smaller in scope the better, was the only way to preserve liberty and combat a consolidated government acting as universal almoner and distributor of special privileges which would in time become a mere centralization of technical and public administration, or, in other words, a business instead of a State. Such liberalism applied to changing economic conditions did not alter in substance but in practice, being based, in fact, on the historical viewpoint adaptable to economic ideas and practical purposes. To neglect these points and concentrate on particular ideas of liberty, individuality and freedom, ossified and narrowed generous ideas and aspirations. There was no opposition in principle between liberalism as social philosophy and radicalism in action, if by radicalism was signified the adoption of policies that brought about drastic instead of piecemeal social changes – or, in other words, by revolution. This combination of liberalism and the principle of revolution was the prevalent liberalism of the South, by name, libertarianism. . .

THUS the heart of his struggle was for individual liberty against the spontaneous drift towards consolidation (the loose

construction of the Constitution), and for colonial democracy against the growing tendency towards an uncritical faith in numerical majorities. That is, what he opposed was the evil of excess wherein weakness takes pleasure in indulging itself and courts the violent ends of all violent acts.

"Liberty is a reward to be earned, not a blessing to be gratuitously lavished on all alike. The reward reserved for the intelligent, the patriotic, the virtuous and the deserving, is not to be visited on the degraded and vicious who are capable neither of appreciating nor of enjoying it." And as for liberty and equality being intimately united, "To an extent the equality of citizens in the eyes of the law is essential to liberty in a popular government. But to make equality a *condition* essential to liberty would be to destroy both liberty and progress. The reason is that inequality of condition, while it is the necessary consequence of liberty, is at the same time indispensable to progress."

The distinction he drew (with slavery as a background) was, of course, between liberty and freedom—a distinction which any society recognizes in its penal system in depriving the degraded of their liberty. But there was a deeper cultural significance to be discovered in the distinction, in that liberty was, to civilized men, always the sphere of action *limited* by civilization, religion and the law, and thus limited, civilized men could never be free. Thus liberty must always be accompanied by cultural limitations: withdraw them, and there remained only unlicensed freedom: then the State must come forward to control that license: the people must revolt when the State became tyrannical, and if successful they won —not liberty, since its limitations had been lost—but mere *freedom.* So freedom was the objective of slaves, not of cultured men, for there were no limitations upon it.

It was this distinction between liberty and freedom which coloured Calhoun's conception of democracy. Democracy, he believed with de Tocqueville, was irresistible because it

was the most uniform, the most ancient, and the most permanent tendency to be found in history. As for the masses, whatever their weaknesses, it was true that they were in the aggregate willing to sacrifice life for liberty; and the faith of mankind must be expressed (since, as Jefferson observed, heaven does not send angels to govern them) in terms of mutual dependence, or a mutual call upon humanity. Democracy, therefore, represented justice as well as reality: justice because it was the expression of that aspiration in each individual by which men are raised, and a gift of God Himself as defined by the equality of human souls; and reality, because its swift momentum made the people the arbiters of their own terms. That greed and fear held sway at any particular time, thus delaying the fulfilment of higher aims, was no proof that the people were incapable of anything but greed and fear, but rather that the habit of procrastination was a natural instinct, causing the people to be as slow to essay good as to essay evil.

It was, then, the perversion of the masses by greed and fear, rather than any doubt of their inherent sympathy for what was noble, that convinced Calhoun that the danger of a mere numerical majority was a fundamental problem of political justice. For, irresponsible in its unrestraint, the majority might become arbitrary, and the more power it wielded the more ruthless would be its disregard of minority opinion. Rousseau no doubt had this in mind when he admitted that so perfect a government as democracy could be practised perfectly only by the gods; and Americans were not gods despite the assertions of the romantics and the belief of the people. The logic of democracy was anarchy; therefore a government was a social necessity—a necessary *evil*, since any government is a potential tyranny. The critical test of a government was the measure of protection it afforded to its weakest citizen: its greatest danger that of becoming centralized in a few hands so that it might be used as an instrument of tyranny.

Thus democracy was doomed to perish between the cognate evils of anarchy and tyranny unless some checks or limitations were imposed upon it. . .

DELVING into the reservoir of American constitutional theory — the Jeffersonian school of States' rights and the Montesquieu system of static government resulting from exactly balanced powers — Calhoun deduced his theory of checks and balances in dialectic so flawless that once his premise is accepted it is imperative to follow him to his conclusion; and his premise is valid insofar as the original premise of American democracy is accepted. Jefferson had believed that the democratic majority would necessarily serve the cause of political justice; his opponents, the Federalists, believed that the division of powers provided in the Constitution was adequate to prevent arbitrary government. Both parties, Calhoun believed, were sound in their major premises, Jefferson contemplating only a limited majority within States' rights, and the Federalists considering only the actually delegated powers to the federal Government, so that in time both doctrines would have become reconciled as the opposing ends of the same truth. But the experience of half a century of democracy had demonstrated that both had gone astray in important deductions, the "pure" Jeffersonians insisting that no restraint be put upon a democracy constantly increasing its powers, the new type of Federalists (industrial nationalists) demanding not only the delegated but the reserved powers be granted to the central Government.

If (Calhoun argued) sovereignty adhered in the people and all authority was delegated, then it followed that the Government was the agent of those delegating such powers, with strictly defined fiduciary powers, all acts of which were subject to review by the principal. Whether such review should be immediate and plenary or more or less removed and limited, was, therefore, the fundamental question of constitutional polity.

Like Jefferson a realist in politics, Calhoun always suspected the "never-ending audacity of elected persons." The desire to rule, and even to exploit, was always existent in virile men; therefore, a popular government merely changed the outward form of the selfish struggle for power by substituting party for class. The division of governmental powers among the executive, the legislature, and the judiciary, was not a sufficient check: a regnant majority might easily control all three branches and thus become thrice strongly entrenched in power.

The sovereignty of the people to control their agents was likewise a fallacy, owing to the popular misrepresentation of the term "the people." Jefferson had profited by European experience (wherein freedom had been taken as a strategic move to align the unthinking mass against the despotism of monarchy) to align the people against consolidation; but it was wicked to use such strategy for any political purpose. The Federalists, however, were worse: understanding clearly the economic origins of political power and the economic ends served by the political State, they had made their knowledge serve their own interests, and concealed their designs by deceptive appeals to "democracy" and "patriotism."

Every true patriot knew that "the people" was a piece of political fiction—that any miscreant could establish the most grinding tyranny by calling himself the people. Society was made up of individuals, each with his particular interest. The detailed interests of the subject-citizens were necessarily complex, not whole; therefore the problem remained one of adjustment and compromise. The whole assumption that government represented the people or rested on their will was a disastrous fallacy. It was an axiom that any political state was partisan to those who administered it; so that the perennial problem of constitutional government was to *restrain the government* by constitutional checks so as to keep it just.

Freedom, the crown-jewel of civilization, was not to be measured by *habeas corpus* acts and simple legal restraints

on tyranny, however; it was rather exemption from *legal* exploitation and statutory dictatorship. "The abuse of delegated power and the tyranny of the stronger over the weaker interests are the two dangers to be guarded against; and if this be done effectually, liberty must be eternal. Of the two, the latter is the greater and the most difficult to resist. . .

"Two powers are necessary to the existence and preservation of free states: a power on the part of the ruled to prevent rulers from abusing their authority by compelling them to be faithful to their constituents, which is effected through the right of suffrage; and a power to compel the parts of society to be just to one another by compelling them to consult the interest of each other."

Having thus denounced the futility of a mere miscellaneous numerical majority, Calhoun went back to the Greeks for the classical definition of true democracy, and to the Eighteenth Century records (of which he gave an elaborate recital) for its proper functions, substituting economic sectionalism for economic classes and finding his social cleavages in economic groups instead of geographical divisions, in order to recast the whole theory of representation.

"There are two different modes in which the sense of the community may be taken: one simply by the right of suffrage unaided; the other by the right through a proper organism. Each collects the sense of the majority. But one regards members only and considers the whole community one unit, having but one common interest throughout; and collects the sense of the greater member of the whole as that of the community. The other, on the contrary, regards interests as well as members, considering the community is made up of different and conflicting interests as far as the government is concerned, and takes a sense of each through its majority or appropriate organ, and the community sense of all as the sense of the entire community. The former I call the numerical or absolute majority; the latter, the concurrent or constitutional majority."

Briefly put, this meant superimposing upon the consolidated, indiscriminate, numerical majority, the will of a geographical majority; or in other words, a special form of sectional referendum. This solution he considered an extension of the principle of democracy, or rather the recovery of the true principle from the Greeks who advocated a co-partnership among classes which had good-will for its rational foundation and functioned only through compromise.

Thus, far from rejecting democracy as the Federalist Hamilton had done, Calhoun recognized it as a noble ideal which had been grossly misunderstood, and debased by handing it to the mob as mere equalitarianism. Opposed to the divine truth of the equality of human souls was the human truth that inequality was a natural and inescapable condition of life. Nature, to whose laws reformers pointed for proof of equality, had no equality, her sovereign law being subordination and dependence. According to the nature of the individual were graded his powers and functions; it was held admirable for all men to aspire to be something higher, it was a mark of degeneracy for men to fall lower than nature had endowed them. All men could not be herbs; but vegetation was sound at core and beautiful in its place. As in nature, then, all men — high, low, capable, weak — must enter into voluntary co-partnership for the common good; else social incompetents would be exploited, as wage or bond slaves, by a capable minority under guise of free labour, or degenerate into mere wards of society.

II

"I have, Senators, believed from the first that the agitation of the subject of slavery would, if not prevented by some timely and effective measure, end in disunion."

In the 30's when the anti-slavery crusade was being efficiently organized in societies and newspapers, Calhoun declared: "Abolition strikes directly and fatally not only at our pros-

perity but our existence as a people. The door must be closed against all interference on the part of the general Government in any form. . . Our fate as a people is bound up in the question. If we yield we will be extirpated; if we successfully resist, we will be the greatest and most flourishing people of modern times. It is the best substratum of population in the world, and one on which great and flourishing commonwealths may be most easily and safely reared."

Southern leaders from the beginning had deplored the unhappy condition introduced into the infant country by the English, and had turned their minds and talents to determining how it could be abolished with justice to both master and slave—for it would be as unjust to deprive masters of their property without due recompense as it would be to give political freedom to the slaves without the economic and social freedom to exercise and enjoy the former privilege. The original draft of the Declaration of Independence had contained a clause repudiating the slave trade which was stricken out "in complaisance to South Carolina and Georgia," Jefferson wrote; but he added, "Our Northern brethren felt a little tender under these censures, for though they had few slaves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others." Calhoun many years before had expressed "shame that South Carolina caused the Constitution to forbid for twenty years any congressional prohibition of the foreign slave trade."

As time and circumstances fastened the institution more firmly upon the South, and the measure of wealth altered from land to slaves, the Southern attitude towards slavery underwent a change both for the better and for the worse—better, in that the person of the Negro became more valuable as property, worse in that the new generation ceased to deplore it as an evil but rather to regard it as an absolute good.

Most informed opponents of slavery were ready to admit that slaves were generally well treated, if not from compassion then out of policy to take good care of valuable property.

Charles Lyell, who went to the South to investigate the institution, wrote that he was amazed at the contentment of the slaves and their boasting of their "white" family. The very fact that slave-owners insisted on teaching their slaves Christianity, with its emphasis upon the equality of human souls, was the best proof that they regarded the black man's soul as precious to his Creator as the white man's—in marked contrast to the Puritan doctrine of Election!—and as a result the Negroes of the South had risen to a higher level of Christian civilization than anywhere else on the globe, especially the savage jungles of Africa. Could a system be entirely evil in which so many phases of it were good? "I hold," asserted Calhoun, "that in the present state of civilization where two races of different origin and distinguished by colour and other physical differences, as well as intellectual, are brought together, the relation now existing between the two is a positive good instead of an evil."

Nor was deliberate white superiority confined to the South as the result of slavery. At the beginning of the Republic only two States had excluded black franchise (and the free Negroes had been permitted to vote in the South until the agitation by Abolitionists made it dangerous), while in 1850 there were only two States—Vermont and Maine where there were few Negroes anyhow—which did *not* exclude it. Schools in the North generally excluded blacks, and in New Hampshire the farmers had gathered five hundred oxen to drag off a Negro school. At the twelfth General Conference of the Methodists in Cincinnati in 1835 two members were censured for having addressed Abolition meetings, and at the yearly meeting of the Friends in Indiana in 1842 the Quaker meeting-houses were forbidden to Abolitionist preachers. Church in the North generally denied blacks burial in the yards; the menagerie at New York denied them admission unless accompanied by white persons; in Northern cities there had been race riots in which many Negroes had perished; and so on. Even the most radical Abolitionist betrayed

by his natural reaction a social antipathy to the black man (and even to the foreigner, especially the Irish, and the Indian), and of what use was political equality without social equality?

It was natural, therefore, that the South should regard the abolitionist agitation as mere sanctimonious pretence. To give the slave a freedom he did not understand and could not use, and impose upon him obligations of which he was not capable, was to turn him out like a child in the wilderness where he must suffer extreme wretchedness and vice. Whatever his capacity, the Negro had never excelled in the arts, the sciences, and the philosophies, the necessary bases of real culture. The reformers' demand that the Negro be given a chance to test his capacity was irrational in itself, for the reason that capacity is not tested by opportunity but by moral courage and talent. Moreover, the Negro had had his chance; he crossed the Euphrates with the white man, and in the ancient world he was no more enslaved than Epictetus. Who lagged behind? When Haiti ended slavery with the bloody scenes of San Domingo, did the Negro go on from there in civilization... or did he revert to savagery, witch doctors, voodoos, strange charms and wangas? The Greeks were slaves: their culture ultimately enslaved their captors.

It was a declaration of principle, therefore, that all men were endowed by their Creator with certain rights, equal as far as there was equality in the capacity of appreciation, judgment and exercise of these rights; but in the divine economy no individual or class of the human race should be permitted to mar the aspects of the earth's transcendent beauty, nor to impede the progress of the physical and intellectual man. Hence a people, upon whatever plane they might be found in the ascending scales of humanity, whom neither the divinity within them nor the inspiration of divine beauty around them could impel to virtues, action and progress onward and upward, should be subjected to a just and humane tutelage of a

superior race until they should be able to appreciate the benefits and advantages of civilization.

From the Puritan standpoint of *Absolute* Good, the brutal slave-driver was really less an enemy to slavery than the benevolent master inasmuch as the latter unreasonably confused the abstract issue. Logically pursued, such a thesis would condemn all human institutions in which metaphysical evil is inherent because of human limitations: the penal system, because it is cruel and heartless; war, because it is wasteful and merciless; government, because it tends to corruption and conservatism; religion, because in the world it is leavened with opportunism. That the penal system protects society; that war involves honour and heroism; that government prevents anarchy; that religion provides the only objective moral standard—all these aspects, however good, are ignored by the reformer once the institution itself is condemned as evil.

Thus the Puritan reformer came to regard slavery: because it was evil there was no phase of it that was good. Since human life has its conditions of servitude, the reformer should have denied (as the agnostic idealist would) that life had any measure of good; but the reformer, invariably an instinctive materialist, is never disposed to condemn what affects his self-interest. The idealization of "freedom" and the savage was a natural combination, for no peoples are freer than the savage from the yoke of civil institutions. But though he has the name of freedom, the savage wants its substance and spirit—liberty—because of the very privation of government discouraging the amelioration of his lot by withholding protection of his property. Thus the Biblical injunction of the Saints (which the Northern preachers urged their congregations to trample underfoot), and the permissions of the civilized men of antiquity, recognized the paradox of human freedom in their appraisal of slavery, knowing that the man fettered by the responsibility of providing for and mastering others was actually less free than the slave who

submitted to protection and care and need be master only of himself. Metaphorically speaking, the celibate has more freedom than the father of many children; nor is the metaphor overdrawn, for the status of Southern slaves was really that of minor children – they had only the rights of minors, but so far as the family was concerned they belonged. Nor could the brutality of an individual planter be cited against the institution any more than the brutality of an inhuman parent be cited against parenthood. The only freedom worth possessing is that which gives enlargement to a people's energy, intellect and virtues; and freedom that prates of equality not to raise the lower but to lower the higher is a slavish concept of liberty, nourished on which, men will remain forever slaves and the good among them will be merely honest slaves. There is nothing so disastrous, so disillusioning, so tragic, as the habit of considering anything right that can be justified rationally: by such a standard not only slavery but prisons, war, government and even religion must be constantly deluged with the tragic blood of quick transition; whereas if unjust systems are tolerated as human paradoxes slowly working towards amelioration through that principle of equity engraved in every human heart – what might be called the Image of God – men may frequently accomplish the same transition without suffering and bloodshed. Sentimentality for the slave, as for the criminal, might create such a reactionary feeling as to augment, rather than ameliorate, his hard lot; and this alone would stay the reformer were he animated less by a desire to have his opinion prevail and secure an admiring audience and more by real wisdom and love for the object of his agitation. . .

But the Negro was not only a person and property, he was a slave and plantation-worker; and this easy association of slavery and labour tended to make Southerners contemptuous of the commonplaces of work and industry and thrift to

which the Puritan (with his usual readiness to exalt whatever aided his material progress) had given the dignity of virtues. Even Jefferson had said, "While we have land and labour let us never hope to see our citizens occupied at a work-bench or twirling a distaff." While it was true that Providence decreed work for the good of man's body and soul, whatever Providence decreed must necessarily possess *soul*, without which work was drudgery, a mere household god labelled *Industry* that exacted the most slavish devotion, was jealous of liberty, and hated the rose because it was rich and purposeless; and as such had been accounted accursed in the Garden of Eden. By this spiritual distinction, black slavery was favourably comparable to any institution of labour anywhere. "I hold that there never has yet existed a wealthy and civilized society in which one portion of the community did not, in point of fact, live on the labour of the other," said Calhoun. "The devices to accomplish this are almost innumerable, from the brute force and gross superstition of ancient times to the subtle and artful contrivances of modern times. I might well challenge a comparison between them and the more direct, simple and patriarchal mode by which the labour of the African race is, among us, employed. I may say with truth that in few countries is so much left to the share of the labourer, and so little exacted from him; or where there is more kind attention paid to him in sickness or in the infirmities of age." The pioneer farmers of the West were free men, but the lives of most of them were wretched and dreary in comparison with the slaves who toiled on the great plantations of the South. Great Britain had, in her unique moral wisdom, freed the slaves of her dominions (?) and exercised the most scrupulous regard for search and seizure to prevent traffic in them; but according to Lord Ashley's *Report of 1842* his commission found more than five thousand white women at work underground in mines in the north of England, half-naked, harnessed with heavy leather straps to coal-cars which they pulled on all fours, for

a miserable pittance a day. Or, consider the New England factories where nearly a million humans were employed—one-quarter of them women—according to the Census of 1850. In Lynn, the women shoe-workers outnumbered the men. Many of the workers were children, their tiny looms having first been made especially in England at the order of Alexander Hamilton who piously justified woman and child labour by saying that they had nothing else to do and work kept them out of mischief. In the Providence area where an Englishman started the textile industry and the "English System" prevailed, whole families above the age of five were frequently employed from twelve to fourteen hours a day. When new hands were needed a long black wagon known as a "Slaver" went about picking up wage-slaves at a dollar a head. Only recently the Boston Marine Society had appealed to the courts to establish their right to flog seamen to their work; and it was primarily the work of a Virginian, John Randolph, that had accomplished the abolition of flogging in the Navy. Was this freedom—a system by which dead matter left the factory transformed and ennobled whilst workers were corrupted and degraded? At least the slave-owners considered the welfare of their servants' souls: the factory employer regarded his workmen as mere tools.

Calhoun had no love for property. "I would not be rich in America," he wrote, "for the care of money would distract my mind from more important concerns." Obviously the institution of property in any form involved deprivation: in land, depriving humans of access to many portions of the earth, and still more of the necessary liberty to cultivate it and enjoy the fruits of their labours; in corporations, by paying interest to those who possessed capital, thus subtracting from the earnings of workingmen in direct disregard of the divine admonition concerning the labourer and his hire. Even so he respected property rights, for it was to be admitted that property involved much compensation to the de-

prived, as witness the many institutions built with the excess profits of industry, and the private good any individual might do with whatever profits were in excess of his needs. In any event, the moralizing of their property was the North's problem; and while the South might dislike and disapprove of a system that enslaved the white workers (for grinding poverty and the control of more than a fourth of men's time *was* slavery), any interference with it would not only have been impertinent but would have seriously muddled the situation there.

Just so did chattel-slavery, though it deprived the black man of his freedom, have many phases that were morally and materially good; and founded upon the law of the land, it was too closely interwoven in the economic and social life of the Union to be discarded suddenly. The South had no factories – of a hundred and seven in the country ninety-nine were located in the North – and no mobile wealth and no great urban centres. Of a total of thirty-one millions of population only twelve million were Southerners, and of these nearly four million were slaves. While only three hundred and fifty thousand whites were slave-owners, more than two million were supported in connection with slave labour. The majority of Southern workers were still in agriculture, while in the North industry was rapidly submerging agrarian interests. In the South the plantation was a self-supporting community in which the slaves made practically everything that was required; in the North and Northwest cheaper machinery and increased transportation were providing furniture and clothes and shoes and almost every article required, so that as a general thing little forges in the farmers' kitchens for making nails and tacks were the last survivals of the old community independence. In a word, conditions in the two sections were utterly unlike, and consequently their material interests; and since property could not be moralized on the one hand for profit and condemned on the other

for the same reason, the South asked, in the same spirit in which she conceded that privilege to the North, to be let alone to work out her own destiny. . .

PERHAPS the status of property was in transition, and, like the rise and fall of nations, could not be set aside by resolutions; but it still remained to accomplish it by the generous energies of men's minds to accord with the venerable tradition of civilization, rather than by violence and bloodshed after the manner of the parvenu's passion for specialization. As to the result of the latter course so far as property was concerned, it required no prophet to discern that the establishment of any legend that because a given form of property is considered immoral it may be forthwith confiscated, must tend to weaken American institutions, and the success of any reform movement for such confiscation would (since reformers spring from the lower classes) ultimately lower the personal dignity of public life. There is no cult so vulgar as that which is based on the belief that God will help those who forcibly help others.

III

"The Constitution interprets itself. It announces itself to be the supreme law of the land."

IN the domain of civilized human action three fields of law had ever been recognized: the laws of free choice in religious faith and morality; the laws of manners, binding upon people of good taste; and the positive laws of the State demanding obedience from all alike. That the three fields were inseparable was immediately obvious, for positive laws were unstable unless founded upon the manners of a nation, and manners were the only durable and resisting (moral) power of a people. That the three fields should be kept distinguishable was, however, equally obvious; for when faith and morality and manners were regulated by *positive* statutes, they ceased to

have virtue and became mere prohibitions and standardizations.

It was an axiom that the positive law as constituted was a poor enough device for catching the flies and permitting the wasps to break through, as wise men from Anacharsis down have reminded us; but nevertheless it represented at any given time the best that men could achieve to guard, circumscribe and defend their lives, liberty and property, and thus far it was the moral sentiment of a people. But the principles by which the right kind of government was formed, the right kind of laws adopted, and the right kind of public policy determined, were not *instinctive* nor to be discovered by emotional reaction: they required study and philosophy, and above all, precision. To be wise they must be merciful; but mercy had its conditions, and what was mercy to the many might not seem so to the one, and what seemed hard to the one might be mercy when viewed by the eye that looked on through eternity. Thus law kept up its credit not because all laws were good but because they *were* the law: such was the mystical foundation of their authority. And the law as it stood was designed to protect the institution of slavery as property, not only in the slave-States but in the District of Columbia and the common properties in the territories.

If, therefore, the North and South had little meeting ground in the first two fields, at least they had a common law; and ordinary human progress in material civilization depended not only upon creative skill and constructive industry but upon a system of law and institutional control to secure the individual's efforts being directed towards creating new wealth instead of destroying that of others. This in itself was real morality, a recognized code of conduct to fill the gap where penal and public sanctions were inapplicable; and its sanction was social disapproval of the individual conscience as a public guide.

Thus, while a high personal standard was indispensable in

reflecting itself in the law, the intrusion of the individual conscience into political affairs (the "Higher Laws" of Seward, Chase, Giddings and Garrison) meant anarchy in the venerable *process* of the law. In place of the laws of free choice they would substitute a shoddy state-controlled moralism and humanitarianism—shoddy, because no good may be done without wisdom, and wisdom has never yet been invested in any state. In place of manners they proposed legal prohibitions and restrictions, the trend of which was easily discernible in the fiery utterances of reformers and Northern preachers to "teach manners" to Southerners (by statute). This narrowed the whole venerable process of the law down to the positive laws; but instead of repudiating the last as they pretended, what they really wanted was more statutes and still more, the very multiplicity of which would bring them all to a negation and so make it possible to standardize an industrialist and lawyer-ridden generation. . .

CALHOUN had hoped that if the law of the land was no longer a binding force between the two sections the Constitution would be. But how could it be when the Constitution was the source of the very principles inculcated into the law—the protection of life, liberty and property? For no one doubted that the Constitution itself recognized slaves as property and admitted the right of ownership in them, and that all the States had pledged their faith not to interfere with those in which the institution existed. It was impossible to say exactly what was in the minds of the Fathers who framed the Constitution, but it was generally agreed that they never contemplated a two-party system of government to interpret that instrument in terms of party victory. Citizens of the enlightened Eighteenth Century, they believed in a commonwealth of the people, for the people, and by the most intelligent of the people. They devised, therefore, a system in accord with those principles whereby it became an experiment from which any principal had the right peace-

ably to withdraw. This was not a strict-constructionist theory, for the Constitution never contemplated any moratorium in a grave emergency. Nor was it the current modern theory of "social statics" (as exposed by Herbert Spencer) holding the course of human events to be controlled, as in evolution, by inexorable laws, so that any attempt of man to interfere with that course through legislation must result in disaster. In fact, it was no theory at all: it was the simple self-interpretation of the Constitution, the wise men who wrote the document having purposely included flexibility, but not ambiguity, in its provisions.

The South, therefore, in abiding by the law abided by the Constitution. If the concept of property was to be changed; if the Constitution was anachronistic and inadequate, obviously they must share the fate of all out-moded human institutions, and it should then be determined what was the new political philosophy of the American people and a better constitution made. It was as bad for a nation as for an individual to lead a double life; and it was national guilt if the Union persisted in an hypocritical adherence to the Constitution as a sacred and binding compact while simultaneously ignoring its basic guarantees in practice.

But as long as the present Constitution was retained, the South purposed to take her stand upon it. She occupied the same ground as did the Fathers in 1776. To her, the Constitution was first and last an instrument of government whose keynote was liberty — not for bearing upon disputed points of policy. It was constituted by the terms of the compact by all the States through the express will of the people thereof — a common agent to use and exercise and limit powers that were inherent in the sovereignties of those States. In accordance with the principles upon which the American theory was founded, the central Government could exercise only delegated power: hence if those who had been chosen to administer the Government assumed to exercise powers not delegated, they must be regarded and treated as usurpers.

And whenever the chosen officers or delegates failed or refused to administer the Government in strict accordance with the letter of the accepted Constitution, it was the solemn right and the imperative duty of the people to resist the functionary and if need be expel his creatures by force of arms. Such resistance was not revolution: it was an assertion of rights, the exercise of all the attributes which imparted honour and dignity to manhood. By every principle for which the States had waged past wars, the South alone had the *right* to win in such a struggle. . .

It was significant that the spirit of reform – the touchstone which differentiates a people so incisively – emanated chiefly from New England (in two decades *seven hundred* reforming societies had originated in the North, mostly in New England) where it was inherent in the character and life of the community which that life had developed; and this leaven was gradually carried to almost every new community by preachers and teachers. Newspapers (which, being organs of exposition, are therefore organs of reform) increasing yearly were becoming the great educators of the masses, to whom lack of facts and promiscuous facts are alike disastrous. For when the book, the pulpit, art, the theatre, the forum, and the platform are all rolled into one and reduced to the popular level, the ignorant who fear mental discipline are disposed to welcome whatever presents fifty subjects to the mind in ten minutes; the vulgar like to see "shocking things made familiar and familiar truths withdrawn"; the superstitious are satisfied with omens and prodigies made palatable as pseudo-science and health fads; the lazy who find thinking painful are enabled to get a minimum of information and a maximum of comment (the latter being the ready-made opinions on which the journals were finding they could wax strong and great). But the primary function of the newspapers was that in the new national and industrial democracy it was inevitable that opinion must be based on news; and

since opinion could be bribed, its organs, controlled by political and industrial groups, tended to become mere anti-liberal propaganda sheets instead of the bearers of the manna of news, the record of the day's history. And since the newspapers must seek novelty, sensational bias, false optimism, and malicious criticism to attract circulation, they tended to become the enemies of perfection by engrossing all literature; and the editors and columnists replaced the old Puritan preachers as grumbling and censorious givers of advice – the tutors of nations so detested by Napoleon.

The South, where such reforming tactics were generally dismissed as merely shocking bad manners, had first looked upon the Abolitionists as sincere fanatics (though sincerity is also characteristic of the lunatic) dominated by the reformer's congenitally blind conviction and uncritical singleness of view which made him really believe himself to be as good as those who opposed him were wicked. But when the Abolitionists began to defy the law, burn the Constitution, and threaten the white women of half a continent with the unleashed lust of a savage race, their contempt changed to horror. These reformers were not seeking the freedom of slaves because they loved the black man: they did not even *know* him! They had no plan for the preparation of the Negro for social and economic freedom – how he was to earn a living when emancipated, how three million childish, semi-savage people of his kind were to be disciplined in the ways of civilization. The *cause* was Abolition; not the general welfare of society. In their hurry to win applause in their short human span, the reformers would ruthlessly sacrifice the slave to their vanity – reducing him to wretchedness and poverty as "the slave of the community instead of the individual" for the sake of an empty political freedom which he had not the social and economic freedom to enjoy. As for the white South, well . . . "God help them if the Negro ever rises in revolt, or if emancipation ever comes!" the reformers exulted. In this piously satisfying thought was re-

vealed their real motive: not love for the slave but hatred of his master.

Those immersed in the transition of property generally lack the perspective to observe whether the struggle follows the historical pattern – the lower classes coveting and acquiring wealth; wealth overlapping aristocracy; the aristocracy abdicating or taking on wealth; and the plutocracy taking on the manners of aristocracy and in time its philosophy. The industrialists were, of course, no more interested in the morality of slavery than in the morality of individualist capitalism; and abolition (except insofar as it would open a larger territory for the sale of manufactured articles hitherto made by slaves or imported from Europe) was not an end but the means of impoverishing economically and demoralizing culturally the section which stood as an economic and cultural barrier to the plutocratic goal of consolidation in politics and standardization of society. But since the South had the law and the Constitution on her side, slavery could not be attacked as a political institution; hence the reformer's "Higher Law" became highly useful to the industrialists, reform ever being more fortuitous than political party.

The "Higher Law" was not new in Puritan ethics, Thomas Cooper having written Hamilton as early as 1836: "The idea of these New England theologians that their notions of religious duty are to supersede all law, is inconsistent with the well-being of civilized society, and elevates every ignorant fanatic into an irresponsible dictator." No doubt abolitionism would have soon died as a caricature of the Puritan religion had it not become a middle-class technique supported by the sentimentality of the minor intellectuals and the practicality of the business interests; but with this support the reformers, having kept alive a prosaic "conscience" awaiting a ripe political situation to give it expression, became the stormpetrels of the industrial revolt in the name of progress (for attacking anachronisms has always been the easy standard by which a reformer may be classed as "progressive"), and con-

stituted the blatant voice of middle-class reform, disturbing the rational order by sowing the seeds of discord and discontent, preaching equality to destroy classes in order to recreate a tyrannical bourgeoisie of Marxian self-negation. In the name of progress, said the New England preachers, men worked; if work developed the community then work was a patriotic duty; if performing one's patriotic duty produced money then money-making was a moral duty; if moral duty was a virtue then money-making was not merely controlled by virtue—it *was* virtue! If leisure and artistic preoccupations and criticism impeded the speed of money-making, then these things were effeminate if not sinful. Moreover, taking their cue from Big Business, the reformers ceased agitating as individuals and began to organize, thus initiating the "epoch of association" in reform. "Collective man is omnipotent upon the earth he treads!" No longer did they abuse the law; they learned to make new laws. No longer did they burn the Constitution; they set about remoulding it. No longer did they curse the Union; they became the most ardent nationalists.

The proletariat enthusiastically joined in the crusade, in general because they recognized the industrialists as their own class plus capital, and in New England particularly because there the workingman had been taught to believe that whatever helped his community, in which his material interests were bound up, helped him. Even feminine stalwarts, the daughters of respectable farmers, small merchants, clergymen, and teachers, toiled two hours before breakfast at spindle and loom and returned after supper to the factory to round out their stint of fourteen hours, going thence to the town green or meeting-house to join a committee to draw up resolutions insisting, as *free* women, on their right to have the same measures meted out to them as to men! Or, after their Nature Classes, Improvement Circles, and their Lyceum Nights (to hear the aphoristic hodge-podge of Everett and Emerson on *Self-Reliance*), proceeding to a French or Ger-

man Class to debate the moral issues involved in working with cotton produced by slave-labour. If the self-reform and prying among themselves paled, there were numerous channels for regulating others: The *American Anti-Slavery Society*, the *American Temperance Union*, the *American Peace Society*, the *Women's Rights Clubs* (demanding equality before the *law* in general learning), the *Samaritan Female Society* (providing red-flannels for seminarians), the *Prison Reform Movement*, and scores of other interesting movements, all reflecting an optimism and haste to secure the Freedom of Man, and an impatience with all states of servitudes—a veritable plague of fads and isms escaping from Pandora's Box of Individualism. But progress without freedom is, alas, an empty name lacking all substance, and it required no prophet to foresee that the wage class, an unorganized proletariat swollen by more than two and a half million immigrants, would have the name but not the substance of industrial democracy: common education laying the most stringent restrictions on the development of the individual; and universal suffrage permitting bosses to lead the workers to the polls and use their electorate in the interest of those who would not hesitate to give away a substance of the State to get votes, and forcing the wealthy to resort to any propaganda to influence public opinion in favour of plutocracy. . .

SINCE the vanity of acquisitive men does not permit them to own to materialistic motives alone, they welcome whatever gives a good reputation to their pragmatism; and nothing served this vanity better than the doctrine of Predestination which left men free to think of worldly profit and gave a pious justification to usury. New England Calvinism united with the new commercial forces was a wedlock of incompatibles effected by common enmity to the established order, providing a theocratic ideal suffusing the rights of the commercial class with a sense of holiness in business. Self-

righteous pragmatists, who instinctively confused their own welfare with the well-being of the public and the Will of God, were thus enabled to use the will-to-power in the economic field which the Puritan had formerly exercised in the religious and social fields. Righteous action being whatever the law allowed, the next step was to make the statutes sanctify whatever men *wanted*, whereby the politicians who made the laws and the business men who dictated those laws would be the ultimate judges of public morality.

Such was the middle class which the ruin of the South was to elevate to the ruling power; a class limited to the aimless accumulation through money of the cultural achievements of men of noble action and priestly thought, yet tending to destroy parasitically what it accumulated: perverting religion by turning it into "art," subverting nobility by debasing style into conventions and inner form into superficial taste, substituting money-economics for the feudal concrete sense of destiny resting on the peasant-soil, building great cities in which the restless intellect thrived, the city in turn replacing primitive values of the land by the absolute idea of money. At its cold peak such a civilization would harden into an abstract intellect to replace the concrete the life of the soil, a civilization which moved in the realm of spirit towards science, and in the realm of economics towards finance-capitalism; producing a new system of investment and speculation which, depriving men of the sense of responsibility that land-ownership gives them, would permit a class-rule of money, and relieving men of the responsibility for creating their fortunes alone, would permit ruthless exploitation of the masses who would stoically submit or collectively resist in the hope that they too might wield the power to exploit others. For with the triumph of such socially disintegrating forces men would soon cease to be attached to any institutions that promised permanency; each class, seeking its own interest, would have no organic sense of the whole, and rulers, instead of ruling for the good of the organism, would use place and power for

private and speculative ends, thereby destroying in the people that higher psychic life of which the essential trait is loyalty to the body of which they are members.

Well knowing that the will of the majority, unchecked by idealism, tended to become the will of a rabble and finally anarchy, the plutocracy trusted to their own peculiar talent for organization and their control of labour-bosses to keep the proletariat – debased and swollen with radical immigrants goaded by poverty as the result of private wealth and lack of general prosperity – unorganized, thus putting back the progress of the workingmen a century. With the boss-system thus organized and the workingmen unorganized, what could ultimately result but organized crime on the one hand and communism on the other? The prated humanitarianism of the industrialists was, therefore, a snare; for any liberalism that did not make full cultural freedom supreme, and did not see the relation between it and genuine industrial freedom as a way of life, was degenerate and delusive.

In the end . . . such a system, based on predatory irresponsibility and organized cupidity, would have to go – be it a century thence; and when political liberalism founded on nationalism and private economic enterprise was discarded, it would be found that the only thing to replace it would be a political religion based on new forces of production due to science and technology whose logic was the Marxian justification of irrationalism. Political and economic facts are undoubtedly the marks of decay; but the mental correlates associated therewith are invariably vital.

The extremes of capitalism and communism were – despite the repudiation of the fact by Northern National-Republicans – by a dreadful polarity mutual attractions. It was not mere reaction, which might be stayed at a mean as in the swing of a pendulum: rather, it was actual affinity. Both had the same aim: to sow the seeds of discord and discontent, and preach equality to destroy natural classes in order to recreate a tyrannical bourgeoisie of Marxian self-negation. Finance-socialists

and trust-magnates correspond absolutely to the mass-leaders of labour parties and communistic commissars: all dealer-natures with parvenu tastes.

Thus the Republican Party, composed indiscriminately of industrial capitalists and discordant radical reformers, proposed to confiscate Southern property (slaves) on the ground that slavery was immoral. This was clearly an invitation to another generation to confiscate any property they might think immoral – a doctrine the communists would be entitled to use when it came to confiscating private banks, railways and coal mines. The effort of the industrialists to consolidate and nationalize the Government was, moreover, in essence a socialistic and bureaucratic ideal that would pave the way for a future communistic dictatorship. But most significant of all was the communistic organization of the industries in which individual workers were reduced to aggregations for collective uses whereby the worker became a mass-man as a part of the mechanism, existing entirely for the owner who thus usurped the role of the State. What would happen when these factory workers, denied their right of collective bargaining, demanded their communistic privileges and looked to the State (the only national organization) for redress? Even Machiavelli's *Prince* of the City-State was dubious about his scope when confronted with a national situation!

CULTURALLY, the debasement of the nation would be even greater, for where men have no understandings to cultivate there are no arts to promote – only battles and invasions to record and science to worship. Without the ability to listen to the past, or the will to follow in the future, men must take refuge in their own superiority, dodging issues and living from day to day in the hope of worldly advancement. Unable to understand that the *anti*-attitude could not eliminate the influences they opposed, they would become contemptuous of the past which they could not feel, of history which

they did not know. Since they observed (but did not reason) that nature was self-supporting and civilization was not, they concluded that the excellent world in which they lived was produced by nature . . . and so retrogressed from the artificial to the natural, from art to nature, back to the barbarism towards which all civilization that is not continuous must tend. What were the considerations to be determined? Alas, they did not know. They only knew that the "nation" must be born even if the Union was destroyed and the citizen ruined. Precursors of change, they put a premium on any new ism; content to be made by the world, they preferred ignominious success to glorious failure; specialists and experts, they must create their own superman from science to take the place of a Lost God. Abstract individualism and abstract collectivism can have but one cause and one end—the withdrawal of man from the divine foundations of life and the final destruction of humanism. . .

CALHOUN erected the last barrier against the progress of middle-class aims—consolidation in politics and standardization in society, and a universal cash-register evaluation of life: the barrier was blown to pieces by the guns of the Civil War. Historically he was the last spokesman of the great school of the Eighteenth Century.

IV

"*I fix the probable occurrence* (the dissolution of the Union) *within twelve years.*"

WITHIN that time twenty-one thousand miles of new railroad—seven-ninths of the total mileage of the whole country—had been laid at a cost of seven hundred million dollars. The year of Calhoun's death (1850) the Illinois Central was awarded nearly three million acres in alternate sections between Chicago and Mobile. New lines were projected through uninhabited and undeveloped areas in the blind hope

that civilization would advance more rapidly than the day when the bonded indebtedness had to be paid off. With no order or planning in construction, parallel lines laid through territory which needed only one line, ruinous competition, and different-gauge tracks (seven kinds were already in use) to prevent another State operating through-trains, the waste was tremendous. Benton, horrified at the increasing squandering of government resources, urged the Government to build the Pacific railway; but Douglas wanted it done by private enterprise. Though huge quantities of gold had been discovered in California (fifty-five millions in one year), even that was not enough to finance so gigantic an enterprise. Abnormal credit was resorted to which the gold reserves made possible in an even greater amount by paper currency and bank credit; and such credit being greater than could be used in normal industry, it had to overflow into speculative uses.

The industrial unity of the country was proceeding while its political unity fell apart.

The Crimean War had opened a great and profitable grain market (wheat rose from thirty cents to a dollar and seventy cents) and exports of breadstuffs and cotton were correspondingly high; but with the fall of Sebastopol in 1855 the curtailment of this market, added to the collapse of speculative credit, produced the usual panic. Practically all banks suspended specie payments. The popular cry against Wall Street (that convenient scapegoat when greed is outraged) was raised. Mobs walked the streets of New York crying, "Bread or death!" Federal troops had to be sent to guard the sub-treasury. Fur traders having pushed their way far into the Santa Fe Trail, there was a revival of emigration, its ranks of panic-stricken Americans augmented by migrators from discontented Ireland and Canada. A Methodist pioneer band was massacred in Utah by Mormons and Indians. A great mutiny in India added to the international depression. Modern society, as the bewildered Calhoun had

cried years before, was indeed "running to some new and untried condition."

Science and invention continued their steady advance. The first train had crossed the Isthmus of Panama, and the same year the cable was laid from Cape Breton to Newfoundland. The telegraph was in universal use. Astronomical discoveries were a commonplace. Whale oil had been brought back from Hawaii by missionaries to inaugurate a new lighting process. Gas was generally used in all the large cities. In America, the hydraulic turbine, the electric locomotive, and the elevator were added to the sewing-machine and rotary printing-press in the steadily growing list of inventions. In England, Portland Cement had been developed, the steel-converter invented, and aniline dyes perfected. In France, the gyroscope was invented; in Austria, duplex-telegraphy. It was the eve of spectrum analysis, cellular pathology, psycho-physics; the revelations of Louis Pasteur in bacteria, of Gregory Mendel in heredity; the researches of Lyell, Faraday, Helmholtz; the economics of John Stuart Mill; the evolution of Charles Darwin; the learning of Herbert Spencer, and the erudition of Thomas Huxley and Pierre Berthelot. . .

In the arts, in which the potentialities of man are most graphically revealed, the theme was dispossession and repossession: dispossession of the soul that had lost its medieval house of spiritual, intellectual and social unity; repossession through frantic efforts to replace, by self-exploration or a romanticist creed and progress, the lost reality by one within each human spirit, and through science and discovery a new absolute in natural law or in ideal logic. In America, the Anglo-Saxon dislike of distinctions (since distinctions are never realized) was enhanced by the characteristic optimism of the times, and the elevation of necessity over luxury added to the confusion of the useful and fine arts whose aspect, whole or fragmentary, reflects the society which fathers them.

In music, the singing of Jenny Lind and the minstrels of Christy were equally applauded. Wagner, Gounod and Offenbach were fashionable; but Grand Opera was established at New York more as an adjunct to high society than to satisfy any real need such as the sentimental ballads of Stephen Foster met. Jeremiah Cathcart's melodeon had brought music to small churches, and Lowell Mason's adaptations of the German classics had brought form to religious music; but as a sensual art of the prophets, the rainbow of promise translated out of seeing into hearing, the American sense of music had so far contradicted Goethe's assertion that it was the one art which required no novelty. In the world of dance the years were dull (most of the applause being reserved for the singers), and Thackeray and Balzac were sighing that a changing world would soon forget the classic charm and grace of the hunchback Marie Taglioni, now living in poverty at Marseilles and teaching *deportment.*

Painting had degenerated since the middle of the past century, though photography had advanced since the discoveries of Daguerre and Niepce in the past two decades. Emmanuel Lentze's reproduced engravings sold by the thousands. The Hudson River School were the successors of Copley, Stuart and Peale; but American artists generally sought their inspiration in Europe in the schools of Italy and Germany where the academic standard still prevailed stronger than in England. In the latter country Rossetti, Hunt and Millais had established the cult of pre-Raphaelitism upon Keats's dictum that the early Italian painters were superior to Raphael whom the Academists were imitating. In France, Gustave Courbet had issued his pungent "Manifesto"—a gauntlet thrown down to the Academy and tradition in behalf of the younger painters reaching for naturalism and impressionism. The mechanistic pseudo-science of the uninitiated divided even artists into adherents or opponents, the former reflecting the social reconstruction of the world in sordid commonplaces, the latter taking refuge in a stilted traditionalism. . .

LITERATURE was becoming more and more a social technique, though the best writers endeavoured to turn the advancing tide of industrialism into channels prescribed by their Eighteenth Century libertarian theories and their timeless dream of social harmony. In France, Balzac, Béranger, Chateaubriand, Constant, Cuvier, Maistre, Picard, Sue, Thierry and de Tocqueville were dead or dying. Compte, whose positivism had amazed the world, and de Musset, who had revealed the pretentiousness of romanticism, were to die before the end of the decade. Hugo, Merimée, Dumas *père*, and Sand were writing novels; Victor Cousins was studying metaphysics, Sainte-Beuve was turning to descriptive criticism; Flaubert was writing scientific realism, Renan his unmoral religion, Taine his philosophic impressionism. The younger school, writers of the *Soirée Medan*, included the gentle Russian giant Turgénef, de Goncourt, Gavarni, Paul de St. Victor, Baudelaire, Scherer, Charles Blanc, Hébard, Verne, Fromentin, Broca, Ribot and Nefftzer. In England, Dickens, Mrs. Browning, Carlyle, Tennyson, Thomas Reed, Thackeray, Kingsley, Bulwer, Miss Yonge, Macaulay, Trollope, Browning and Disraeli were adding to their fame, while the younger writers, Eliot, Ruskin, Lytton, Rossetti and Mathew Arnold established theirs. In Germany, Heine and Hegel were dead, Schopenhauer and the Grimms old and infirm; and they were being replaced by the poet Reuter and the historians Meyer and Muller.

In America, Poe, Cooper and Irving were dead or dying; Emerson was writing and lecturing, still insolent to orthodoxy, still preaching in homely symbols of high-minded youth, encouraging all to rely on intuition and attain all by mere effort; Alcott was writing his *Scriptures* (as he called his diary); Thoreau, the long-nosed eccentric, had given the world his two best books in which a wholesale observation of nature and a precise touch and meagreness of phrase ranked him higher than Emerson as a writer if not as a philosopher. Hawthorne, the most prolific American writer of the

time, produced eight of his best works in a decade. This genial and human writer, revising his blunt phrases into embroidered words under the watchful eye of his practical wife, found at Lenox a company of congenial spirits – the poet Longfellow, who had succeeded Ticknor as professor of English at Harvard; Bryant, who was regularly producing second-class poetry; Herman Melville, whose *Moby Dick* was to win him fame; the preacher Henry Ward Beecher, whose thunderings at petty vices (which it was said he practiced in private) were engaging his middle-class Brooklyn congregation; the reformer, Charles Sumner, recovering from the severe thrashing given him by a South Carolinian in the Senate Chamber; and the latter's ardent admirer, the English actress Fanny Kemble, who, having divorced her Georgia husband because of a disagreement about slavery, had come to live in that part of America she found most congenial. James Russell Lowell, a learned and excellent craftsman but without genius, wit or fire; and John Greenleaf Whittier, the "God-touched laureate of the slave," a frustrated religionist rather than a radical, were perhaps the bitterest of the anti-slavery intellectual group. History (which Protestantism had substituted for the reason of the medieval Church) was becoming more and more popular with the appearance of the works of George Ticknor, the blind and industrious William H. Prescott, and the honest but theocratic George Bancroft, the modern note being struck on a pseudo-scientific basis by emphasizing the material circumstances or economic motive. Popular biography was also making headway, affording, as it did, an opportunity to pry into the private lives of great men, and also to acquire an "outline" of their work without the effort of study.

As an incarnation of the future American middle-class letters – for the middle class must have its literature as well as its culture and politics – Walt Whitman was a notable figure of the era. Born in the outskirts of Brooklyn, this carpenter's son had had a vagrant youth – sometime printer, school-

master, editor of stray country newspapers, carpenter, hobo, and finally writer of eccentric poetry without proclaiming himself a man of letters. His writings were permeated with the conviction that he had a mission to express: to extend the spirit of democracy which he believed to be characteristic of America. Yet no man ever appealed less to the masses. His public was limited, fastidious, over-cultivated, and apt to be of foreign birth. Just as the Yankee having no conception of the Negro preferred to think of him in the pseudo-realistic terms of the melodrama, so the effete and foreign, having no conception of American democracy, preferred to think of it in the garbled pseudo-realistic terms of Whitman. "Comerados," he called his friends in preference to comrades, and with equality established on such a basis it was apparent that the copper coin was equal to the gold coin because both came from the same mint; or in literature dispensing with any standard of excellence by giving importance to the articulate mass-mind concerned with the current crop of machines and inventions.

The American intellectual, therefore, was to be distinguished from the European intellectual by connotation; for whereas in Europe the word had been regarded as applicable to the person who had attained some palpable intellectual distinction or eminence in higher education, in America the term came to be applied indiscriminately to a psychological type, or almost any person with a neurosis who knew how to write. The true intellectual's "fellowship with all creation" was not the naive wonder of Whitman – for wonder is only the beginning of spirituality, and to stop there was to "remain as a child" or a savage; it was not the humanitarianism of a Franklin or the Abolitionist poets, the practical sense of humanity's need; nor was it the emotional sympathy of a gregarious sort, the love of kith and kin, the sentiment of the herd which formed the theme of proletarian expression. Rather, it was the development of the classical

conception of ethical unity of man, or the Christian conception of the spiritual unity of man: a love based on a vivid perception of a peculiarly human, or divine, principle in all men – the "Reason" of Plato and Aristotle, the "Spirit" of Jesus and Paul. It was the love of the Impersonal, rather than of the Personal, Self.

In making this distinction – between the impersonal pure reason or spirit in man, and the personal life of the temperament with its primal drag of nature and race – the true intellectual was a true democrat in that he perceived that the "divine average" was *less* than divine, just as it was *more* than mob-unanimity; and a true artist in that, seeking to represent the idealized image of a truth rather than Absolute Truth, he refused to sacrifice beauty of form for biological, social and physical data or a naturalistic regard for "facts" so denatured of life that they presented only the sordid and squalid as the norm of human nature and the vagaries of the human mind so remote from flesh and blood as to reduce nature to the symbolic mysticism of Ibsen; and a true realist in that he demanded more than transcendental romanticism for his theme, and sought to encompass the spirit of the mysterious enigma of life and to bring order and serenity into passing chaos.

Of all American intellectuals of the age, therefore, only Melville and Poe, with their keen sense of evil inherent in the universe, their resentment against the false optimism and altruism of American life, and their easy terms with the cosmos, placed themselves as geniuses far from their times in refusing the prophetic role and the defence of worldly interests by making realistic reports on the actualities. But their genius was destined to go generally unrecognized in an era in which events were as varied and inconsistent as the plutocratic society and political changes that dominated life . . . when men had the choice of being liberal or reactionary, democratic or absolutist, positivist or orthodox, but never libertarian or cosmopolitan since that would have kept the

State apace with economic and intellectual progress and thus prevented its being smashed to bits that it might be remoulded nearer the heart's desire of the middle class.

V

"*The probability is that it* (the dissolution of the Union) *will explode in a presidential election.*"

THE promise he had made to himself at New Orleans thirty years before to "smash slavery if I ever get a chance" was confidently announced as a party credo when Abraham Lincoln declared, "A house divided against itself cannot stand; this Government cannot permanently endure half-slave and half-free." The new Republican Party was formed out of old discredited pragmatic elements and placed under the leadership of Lincoln for the express purpose of destroying slavery and making way for the new middle-class industrialist civilization.

In times of historical complexities or crises leaders frequently emerge for no other reason than a purely psychic one; and such was the explanation of the emergence of this fifty-year-old poor-white Southerner who had emigrated to Illinois. Instinctive and honest, Lincoln was a genuine individualistic Democrat like Jefferson (whose *Notes on Virginia* he quoted as precedents for his course) who believed implicitly in the common man and was ready to submit his proposals to a vote of the masses that knew nothing of State affairs. Unlike Chase and Stevens, he cared as little for the new commercial aristocracy as Jefferson had for the genuine aristocracy; and had conditions in the country never altered, American democracy might have been revitalized by his leadership instead of brought to its nadir.

But conditions in the country had altered. Jefferson's individualism had been libertarian and agrarian; Lincoln's was humanitarian and industrial. Individualism had found a fair lodging in agrarianism; but, like any virtue, had become by

calculation a vice. Moreover, circumstances, which rule men most who think to use them, had cast the two in a different mould: Jefferson was a cultured and wealthy aristocrat who had a contempt for the prestige which office affords; Lincoln knew that whatever he expected to become must be acquired by office, and he was virile enough to want to make that office as great as possible. So that, more deeply elemental than any man in his party and feeling more strongly the forces beneath the surface, if at times he appeared to be shiftless and at others ruffled by the spirit of compromise, it was because he was waiting for the currents to make themselves manifest that he might set his rudder accordingly. . .

THE strongest force in social organization is its latest current: in the American sense, this was Lincoln's West. The North still had a lingering self-conscious respect for the sovereignty of the States, the Constitution, the Supreme Court, and property rights: the West had not even the tradition of sovereignty, and it looked for protection of its material interests where only it could come from—the central Government. Of revolutionary political democracy and abstract rights culled from the fine-spun theories of a Montesquieu or a Diderot they had not the faintest conception: to them democracy meant social and intellectual equality; and for what self-reliance and joint action of the community could not accomplish they turned to a paternalistic or socialistic consolidation (a conception derived in part from the influx of foreign ingredients). The radical new Republican Party *was* the "strong and pioneer civilization" of the West; the West, which was neither strong nor civilized, *was* Lincoln, a mass-minded frontiersman who had been forced to wrest his living from nature and had learned much of men and their habitats. A reformer at heart and a prohibitionist in practice, his feeling for the under-dog was not reason but instinctive reaction, and he must have known that the oppressed when in power were more likely to oppress others through sheer

frustration of their ego than those whose ideal of liberty had not been warped by servitude. However, he had no intention of allowing hatred to destroy his revolutionary stature; and so he adopted the safe position that while chattel-slavery was founded upon both injustice and bad policy, it was a State issue and the Abolitionist doctrines tended to increase its evils. Any man could take a stand upon the most important matters if he had the ability to make his ideas sufficiently clear to the masses; and Lincoln's ideas, whether or not they seemed right to others, were definite and seemed right to him and his followers if for no other reason than that they were directly related to the principles which underlay the philosophy of his section. In other words, the masses would not of their own volition elevate to a pinnacle any but their own kind, and Lincoln knew – thus establishing a permanent precedent for his party – that the only qualification required for this honour was the articulation necessary to express their mediocrity, the attribute of folk-gods and Messiahs in democracies.

Thus, as when he had helped drive the helpless Indians off their own land only the word *Destiny* was needed as justification, so now the same slogan sufficed to justify the liberation of the long-retarded industrial revolution that his party might hasten the transfer of power to the emergent middle-class groups of large-scale capitalism and begin the destruction (after the *Homestead Act*) of the Government domain by handing over to industrialists (with the help of the Supreme Court, which practically eliminated States' rights) in land grants, terminal sites, perpetual rights of way, and so on, approximately one billion acres – more than half the area of the United States, with all its subsoil treasures of coal, oil, copper, gold and iron – and hundreds of millions in subsidy, an act of largesse without parallel in the tragic history of despotism. . .

Such was the great community nation of which Abraham Lincoln, a man of the soil, dreamt as he walked in the paths

of routine. Neither kind nor cruel, he was merely destitute of the higher order of sensibilities that make the saint or the sinner, no virtues being the paradoxical penalty of no vices. His Falstaffian humour contained no wit; his amiability was animal rather than histrionic; his melancholia, which made him fly his own wedding, a neurosis rather than a pose. His great head with its broad brow and shock of black hair was indicative of both high-mindedness and native cunning; his tall, stooped figure with its long, awkward arms and shuffling gait reminiscent of his nickname, "The Illinois Ape"; while his immense slow-moving hands bespoke eloquently a certain patheticalness that was the keynote of his groping towards strength. In his thin lips, which could smile so whimsically, was to be detected a ruthlessness which he could shrewdly, even amusingly, make others enforce whilst he himself dealt benignly with the victim. His aloofness from men (partly from gaucherie, partly from sensitivity), while elementally so entirely one of them, gave him a tremendous psychic advantage that enabled him to use men for social ends without the least regard for their attitude towards himself.

"I do not expect the house to fall; I do expect that it will cease to be divided, to become one or the other, free or slave." As Lincoln did not expect the whole Union to become slave-holding his meaning was clear: it must all be free. It was a new and startling precedent for a presidential aspirant to base his candidacy on a total disregard of the Constitution (until duly amended) and his platform on a declaration that the Supreme Court's dictum (in the Dred Scott case) constituted dangerous heresy; and though Lincoln justified the latter by declaring that the reasoning of the Dred Scott decision was to be resisted only as a political rule to be followed by the voters, the Congress and the President, his contemptuous estimate of the Supreme Court was prophetic of his subsequent disregard of that body's rulings against his suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus* and his legal-tender and reconstruction policies. Nor did he forget to include a plank for strong

protective tariffs, and, as lawyer for a Western railroad, the *Pacific Railroad Bill*, in his platform.

But Lincoln's stand was no mere gamble on his part. At times of transition the logical leader is he who does not wince at violence. From now on it was to be men against property; the Declaration of Independence against the Constitution; the "Higher Law" against the law of the land as interpreted by the Supreme Court. "The decision," said Greeley, the editor of the chief Republican organ, in regard to the Dred Scott case, "is entitled to just so much moral weight as would be the judgment of those congregated in a Washington bar-room." And again, in regard to the Kansas Bill: "It would be better that the Capitol should blaze with the torch of the incendiary, or fall and bury all its inmates beneath its smouldering ruins, than that this wrong should be accomplished." The Massachusetts Legislature *annulled* the Fugitive Slave Law and permitted it to be openly disobeyed, thus putting into practice what South Carolina had only threatened; only there the nullification movement was not answered by a "Force Bill" and the dispatch of federal military forces, but instead Massachusetts began busily preparing for war of her own initiative by ordering ammunition and increasing her militia.

True, Lincoln's party, even if he obtained the popular vote (which was doubtful) and party-power in Congress, had no mandate to destroy American or Southern institutions and establish Republican theories of nationalism and industrialism, and this Seward had been careful to assert: "Mr. Lincoln is not disposed to question the cardinal doctrine of secession, for the federal State cannot reduce a seceding State to obedience by conquest. Only an imperialistic or despotic government can subjugate disaffected members. This federal system of ours is most unfitted for such labour." And Greeley added the *Tribune's* voice: "We hold with Jefferson to the inalienable right of communities to alter or abolish forms of government that have become oppressive or injurious; and if the

cotton States are satisfied they can do better out of the Union than in it, we are under the necessity of letting them go."

The realistic South was not deceived, however. Lincoln might prate of revolutionary and minority rights, but he trusted in power and had no respect for liberty. "Any people *having the power* have the right to rise against an accepted form of government and form a new one. Any portion of such people that *can* may revolt and put down a minority." If right to Lincoln meant power, that power now resided in the numerical majority which he represented; and therefore the news of his election would be tantamount to a declaration of war against the Southern minority.

"The election of an Abolitionist President would be a species of revolution by which the purposes of the Government would be destroyed and the observance of its forms entitled to no respect," promptly stated Jefferson Davis.

"We are told," said Stephen Douglas, "that the President-elect proposes to enforce the laws in the seceding States. What laws? None that exist. How is he going to enforce them if they existed? By calling out the militia and using the Army and Navy. These terms are used as flippantly as if we were under a military government where martial law is the only rule of action and the will of a monarch is the only law of the subject. . . We are bound to assume that so astute a man as the President-elect is familiar with the laws which he proposes to take oath to administer."

The South Carolina Legislature which had met to choose presidential electors (the last of the States to adhere to that practice) remained in session until the results of the election were assured (Breckinridge and Bell secured a combined vote of a half-million more than Lincoln, thus proving the latter's election to be a purely sectional triumph) and then proceeded for the calling of a State Convention which repealed the ordinance of the Convention of 1788 ratifying the Constitution, and declared the Union between South Carolina and the other States dissolved. In three months six other Southern States

– Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana and Texas – had similarly dissolved the Union.

Seward, expecting to dominate the Lincoln administration, openly gloated in Congress over the North assuming the direction of the central Government. Hammond of South Carolina answered him.

"Do not forget, sir, what can never be forgotten, what is written in the brightest pages of history – that we slaveholders of the South took our country in her infancy, and after ruling her for sixty out of seventy years, we shall surrender her to you without a stain upon her honour, boundless in her prosperity, incalculable in her strength, the wonder and admiration of the world. Time will show what *you* make of her; but no time can ever diminish our glory or your responsibility!"

Quietly the Southern Senators began to resign from the august body their forefathers had created, rather than witness the spectacle of a President taking oath to support the Constitution of that Union he meant to disrupt. Calhoun's spirit was there to lead them as his incarnation would have done had he lived; for though he had never been able to bring himself to the point of advising secession, he could not now have borne to surrender to men who, holding tradition and honour in contempt, knew neither the arts of war nor of the forum, but only the ways of the market-place and counting-house. Like Job, it was better that he had made a covenant with his eyes . . . that they might not look upon those younger than he who held him in derision, whose fathers he would have disdained to have set with the dogs of his flock.

VI

"In the event of abolition the vote to hold office would be conferred upon the slaves in order to raise them to political and social equality with their former owners; and this, uniting the Negroes politically with the North, would be used to hold the South in subjection. . . But the South would not forever submit to subjection; and in the end the Negroes would become the slaves of the community instead of individuals.

"WHENEVER the great natural rights of a people are violated by government, it is the duty of patriots to alter or abolish that government even by force." In the whirlpool of the hour both sides would claim allegiance to Jefferson's sublime doctrine. But where would patriotism, whose noblest motive is the public good, be found in an internecine strife?

Certainly the South had no desire for conflict. Her sons had largely founded the Republic, furnishing both the courageous action and the spiritual dynamo that went into its formation. Beyond the thirteen original States every foot of territory of the Union had been acquired by Democratic administrations dominated by the South. A Southerner wrote the Declaration of Independence; a Southerner led the armies to victory against Great Britain; a Southerner promulgated the Monroe Doctrine; a Southerner first sounded the slogan of the federal Union; a Southerner advanced the constitutional orthodoxy of the Supreme Court to uphold the federal tenets. The South, the most Unionist if the least national of all the sections, had patiently debated the growth of economic antagonisms and sectional interests; but if the repository of angry debate provided no answer save that implacable hatred which must undergo final and bloody solution by the arbitrament of the sword, she would defend herself from aggression on those principles for which the Union had waged all past wars—the right of the integral State to seek its own economic independence—which entitled the South

alone to win. If she won, she would ask but one thing: liberty to go her way in peace.

Surely on the edge of the abyss the North would hesitate. Was it sensible after all to renovate the national house by the use of bombs? War would settle no question, cure no sectional antipathies, convince no one. What was the North fighting for? If it was liberty, she might have it without a sanguinary struggle. If it was the Union, then a constitutional amendment guaranteeing the South permanent rights would prevent secession. If war came and the North won, what demands could she make that would not have been accorded without resorting to a waste of life that would only provide a feast for vultures?

But the vultures were rising with the strength of giants, their bones as yet but cartilages, secure in their guise of American eagles. The Republican Party was already weaving its new banner of respectability emblazoned with the strange devices *Preservers of the Union* and *Standard-Bearers of the Flag* to hide a cause so sordid that future generations would refuse to tell or believe it: how one nation, deeming its uninstructed savagery noble, warred against another not for tyranny alone (which might have been satisfied by domination), nor for gain alone (which might have been satisfied by tribute), but for hatred so violent as to sink the one beneath the other.

"But nevertheless we mean to conquer them, not merely to defeat but to conquer and subjugate them," thus Greeley, speaking in his *Tribune* for the North in general and for the Republican Party in particular, answered Calhoun's prophecy. "When the rebellious traitors are overwhelmed in the field and scattered like leaves before the angry wind, it must not be to return to peaceful and contented homes. They must find poverty at their firesides and see privation in the anxious eyes of mothers and the rags of children. The whole coast of the South must be a solitude."

Yet . . . in the end the restless bird of victory would be

again circling, seeking some new standard upon which to descend; for there is no more fickle goddess than Destiny, and no more inconstant ally than history. Revenge is at best a boomerang, and the desirable fire wrested from heaven is docile only in the hollow tube of Prometheus, and power stolen from the gods is chaos to him who has not the clue to its right use. . .

The height of her fall must measure the loftiness of the South's struggle; and if her resurrection was not like unto a new glorious body, but, like Lazarus, with her cerecloths and the odour of the grave about her old corruptible body with its bleak memory of the pit, through that darkness shines still a glorious faith that is not given to those who die for petroleum and steel but to those whose thought weaves webs without breaking them and who aid fortune by not withstanding her. For the Vaults of the Dead are the human hearts of men where the deep, inarticulate traditions of liberty lie buried, ever ready to be tapped and brought to the surface; and though nations like individuals grow old and die, the past never dies but has an element that blends with the complexities of the future, fulfilling decadent age, offering by its very dangers a challenge to passionate youth to search for heroic experience in a destiny that, giving no victory to things of sound and fury but only tides that ebb and flow, sweeps on like an insurgent flood to unplumbed depths of the ocean and cannot be stemmed.

SOURCES *

Adams, Alice D., *The Neglected Period of Anti-Slavery in America*, Boston, 1908.

Adams, Henry, *John Randolph*, Boston, 1886.

Adams, James T., *The Epic of America*, New York, 1931. *The March of Democracy*, New York, 1932. *The American Tragedy*, New York, 1934.

Adams, John Q., *Writings* (ed. W. C. Ford), New York, 1913.

Ambler, C. H., *Sectionalism in Virginia*, Chicago, 1910.

American Historical Review, The, New York, 1896.

American Review, The, New York, 1934-5.

American Statesmen Series, The, Boston, 1909.

American Whig Review, The, New York, 1845-52.

Ames, Fisher, *Works*, Boston, 1809.

Baldwin, Jas. G., *The Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi*, New York, 1898. *Abraham Lincoln*, Cincinnati, 1904.

Bancroft, Frederick, *South Carolina and the Nullification Movement*, Baltimore, 1928.

Bassett, John S., *Jackson*, New York, 1931.

Beard, Charles A., *The Economic Basis of Politics*, New York, 1922.

Benton, Thomas H., *Thirty Years' View*, New York, 1854.

Berdyaev, N., *The Bourgeois Mind*, New York, 1935.

Beveridge, A. J., *Life of John Marshall*, Boston, 1916.

Bidwell, P. W. and Falconer, J. I., *History of Agriculture in the Northern United States*, Washington, 1925

Bishop, J. L., *History of American Manufactures*, Philadelphia, 1861.

Blanc, Louis, *Discours Politiques*, Paris, 1882.

Blanqui, Louis A., *Critique Sociale*, Paris, 1885.

Bolles, A. S., *The Industrial History of the United States*, Norwich, 1879.

Boucher & Brooks, *Correspondence Addressed to Calhoun*, Washington, 1930.

* All spelling and punctuation of quotations has been made to conform to the author's text.

Boudin, L. B., *Government by Judiciary*, New York, 1932.
Bowers, Claude, *The Tragic Era*, Boston, 1929.
Bowman, H. M., *Congress and the Supreme Court*, Boston, 1910.
Bruce, W. C., *John Randolph of Roanoke*, New York, 1922.
Bryan, George, *The Imperialism of John Marshall*, Boston, 1924.
Buchanan, James, *Works* (12 vol.), Philadelphia, 1911.
Buckingham, J. S., *The Slave States of America*, London, 1842.
Byrn, E. W., *Progress of Invention in the Seventeenth Century*, New York, 1900.
Calhoun, A. W., *The Social History of the American Family*, Cleveland, 1919.
Calhoun, John C., *Works* (ed. R. K. Crallé), New York, 1895.
Cambridge History of American Literature, New York, 1927.
Charleston—City Gazette & Daily Advertiser, The; Courier, The; Mercury, The, Charleston, 1825-50.
Chevalier, Michel, *Lettres sur l'Amerique du Nord* (1833-35), Brussels, 1837.
Coffin, Chas. C., *Building the Nation*, New York, 1883.
Colton, Calvin, *Life of Henry Clay*, New York, 1864.
Coman, Katherine. *Economic Beginnings of the Far West*, New York, 1912.
Congressional Debates, Washington, 1812-50.
Congressional Globe, The, Washington, 1834-73.
Congressional Record, The, Washington, 1812-50.
Corwin, Edward S., *The Twilight of the Supreme Court*, New Haven, 1934.
Cubberley, E. P., *Public Education in the United States*, Boston, 1919.
Curtis, G. T., *Webster*, New York, 1870.
Davidson, Donald—and others, *I'll Take My Stand*, New York, 1930.
Dewey, D. R., *Banking and Credit*, New York, 1922.
Dickens, Charles, *American Notes*, London, 1842.
Dictionary of American Biography, New York.
Dictionary of National Biography, New York.
Dodd, W. E., *Nathaniel Macon*, Raleigh, 1903. *Expansion and Conflict*, Boston, 1915. *The Days of the Cotton Kingdom*, New Haven, 1919. *Statesmen of the Old South*, New York, 1929.
Emancipator, The, New York & Boston, 1834-48.
Encyclopœdia Britannica, Cambridge.
Falconer, J. I. (See Bidwell, P. W.)

Fiske, John, *Old Virginia and Her Neighbors*, Boston, 1897.
Flint, T., *History and Geography of the Mississippi Valley*, Cincinnati, 1832.
Foote, Henry S., *Texas and the Texans*, Philadelphia, 1841. *War of the Rebellion*, New York, 1866.
Fülop Miller, René, *Leaders, Dreamers and Rebels*, New York, 1935.
Garland, Hamlin, *The Westward March of American Settlement*, Chicago, 1927.
Gosselin, Louis L. T. (See Le Nôtre.)
Hamilton, Alexander, *Report on Manufactures*, Boston, 1852.
Hamilton, J. A., *The Constitution Vindicated*, New York, 1864. *Reminiscences*, New York, 1869.
Hart, A. B., *The Southern South*, New York, 1910. *The American Government*, New York, 1917. *The American Triumvirate, Clay, Webster and Calhoun*, New York, 1917.
Herald of Freedom, The, Concord, 1835-46.
Herbert, Henry Wm., *Field Sports in the United States and British Provinces*, New York, 1849.
Holst (See Von Holst).
Holt, Bryce R., *The Supreme Court of North Carolina and Slaves*, Durham, 1927.
Houston, D. F., *Critical Study of Nullification in South Carolina*, New York, 1896.
Howe, D. W., *Political History of Secession*, New York, 1914.
Hoyle, Edmond, *Games*, Philadelphia, 1873.
Hunt, Gaillard, *Life of John C. Calhoun*, Philadelphia, 1907.
Ingersoll, Chas, J., *The Second War*, Philadelphia, 1852.
Ingle, Edward, *The Negro in the District of Columbia*, Baltimore, 1893. *Southern Side-Lights*, New York, 1896.
Jefferson, Thomas, *Works* (9 vol.), Washington, 1853. *Notes on Virginia* (2 vol.), London, 1787.
Jenkins, John S., *Life of John C. Calhoun*, Auburn, 1850.
Jervey, Theo, D., *Robert Y. Hayne and His Times*, New York, 1909. *The Railroad, the Conqueror*, Columbia, 1913.
Jordan and Pratt, *Europe and the Civil War*, Boston, 1931.
Josephson, M., *The Robber Barons*, New York, 1934.
Journal of the American Temperance Union, Philadelphia, 1837.
Journal of the Senate, Washington, 1832-50.
Kemble, Fanny (Frances Anne), *Journal of a Residence in America* (2 vol.), London, 1835. *Journal of a Residence on a Georgia Plantation in* 1828-39, New York, 1863.

Knights of the Golden Circle—treason trials, Cincinnati, 1865.
Lamartine, Alphonse de, *Œuvres*, Bruxelles, 1833.
Laws of Etiquette, by a Gentleman, New York, 1839.
Le Nôtre, G. (Gosselin, Louis L. T.), *Le Roi Louis XVII et l'énigme due temple*, Paris, 1921.
Lewis, George, *Impressions of American Churches*, Edinburgh, 1845.
Liberator, The, Boston, 1831-65.
Lodge, Henry C., *Daniel Webster*, Boston, 1883.
Logan, John H., *History of the Upper Country of South Carolina*, Charleston, 1859.
Longstreet, A. B., *Georgia Scenes*, New York, 1847.
Lyman, S. P., *Public and Private Life of Daniel Webster*, Philadelphia, 1852.
Maberly, K. C., *The Art of Conversation*, New York, 1847.
Mallard, R. Q., *Plantation Life Before Emancipation*, Richmond, 1892.
Marshall, John, *Life of Washington*, Philadelphia, 1836.
Martineau, Harriet, *Society in America* (3 vol.), London, 1837. *Retrospect of Western Travel* (2 vol.), London, 1838.
McLaughlin, A. C., *The Court, the Constitution, and Parties*, Chicago, 1912.
McMaster, J. B., *Political History of the United States*, Philadelphia, 1890.
Meigs, Wm. M., *The Growth of the Constitution*, Philadelphia, 1900. *Life of John C. Calhoun* (2 vol.), New York, 1917.
Meisel, Max, *A Bibliography of American National History* (3 vol.), Brooklyn, 1924.
Messages and Papers of Presidents.
Monroe, James, *Writings*, New York, 1898.
Morley, John, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, London, 1903.
National Anti-Slavery Standard, The, New York, 1840-64.
National Intelligencer, The, Washington, 1812-30.
Nevins, Allan, *The American States During and After the Revolution*, New York, 1924. *Emergence of Modern America*, New York, 1927.
New York Herald, The, New York, 1840-65.
New York Post, The, New York, 1840-65.
New York Tribune, The, New York, 1840-65.
Nordhoff, Chas., *The Communistic Societies of the United States*, New York, 1875.

Norton, A. B., *The Great Revolution of* 1840, Mt. Vernon, 1888.
Norwood, J. N., *The Schism of the Methodist Church* (1844), New York, 1923.
Noyes, John H., *History of American Socialisms*, Philadelphia, 1870.
O'Connor, John J., *The Supreme Court and Labor*, Washington, 1932.
Parrington, V. L., *Main Currents in American Thought*, New York, 1927.
Parton, James, *General Jackson*, New York, 1893. *Captains of Industry*, New York, 1893.
Perlman, Selig, *History of Trade Unionism in the United States*, New York, 1922.
Philanthropist, The, Cincinnati, 1836-47.
Phillips, U. P., *Transportation of the Eastern Cotton Belt*, New York, 1908. *American Negro Slavery*, New York, 1918.
Polk, James K., *Diary* (ed. Allan Nevins), New York, 1929.
Pollard, E. A., *Life of Jefferson Davis*, Philadelphia, 1869.
Pomfrey, J. W., *Disclosure and Exposition of the Knights of the Golden Circle*, Cincinnati, 1861.
Porter, David, *Journal*, Philadelphia, 1815.
Pratt, E. J. (See Jordan).
Quincy, Josiah, *The Protection of Majorities*, Boston, 1876. *Figures of the Past*, Boston, 1883.
Randolph, John, *Letters*, Philadelphia, 1834.
Ravenel, Mrs. Harriott H. R., *Life and Times of William Lowndes*, Boston, 1901.
Schaper, W. A., *Sectionalism and Representation in South Carolina*, Washington, 1901.
Schlesinger, A. M., *New Viewpoints of American History*, New York, 1921. *Political and Social History of the United States*, New York, 1925.
Schmucker, S. M., *The Life and Times of Alexander Hamilton*, Boston, 1857.
Schouler, J., *History of the United States Under the Constitution*, New York, 1913.
Smith, Mrs. S. H., *The First Forty Years of Washington Society*, New York, 1906.
Stanwood, E., *American Tariff Controversies in the Nineteenth Century* (2 vol.), Boston, 1903.
Stephens, Alex. H., *African Slavery*, New York, 1861. *The War Between the States* (2 vol.), Philadelphia, 1868.

Summer, W. G., *History of American Banking*, New York, 1876. *The Financier and the Finances of the American Revolution*, New York, 1891.
Taine, Hippolyte A., *History of English Literature*, Edinburgh, 1873.
Taussig, F. W., *Tariff History*, New York, 1910.
Tocqueville, Alexis de, *L'Ancien régime et la Revolution*, Paris, 1859.
Trent, Wm. P., *Southern Statesmen of the Old Régime*, New York, 1897.
Tribune Book of Sports, The, New York, 1837.
Trollope, Anthony, *Domestic Manners of the American*, London, 1862. *The American Senator*, New York, 1877.
Turner, F. J., *The Significance of the Frontier in American History*, Chicago, 1899. *The Rise of the New West*, New York, 1906. *The Significance of Sections in American History*, New York, 1932. *The United States* (1830-50), New York, 1935.
United States Gazette, The, Washington, 1830-50.
United States Telegraph, The, Washington, 1830-50.
Van Tyne, C. H. (See Webster).
Venable, W. H., *A Buckeye Boyhood*, Cincinnati, 1911.
Von Holst, H. E., *The Constitutional and Political History of the United States*, Chicago, 1876.
Wagstaff, H. M., *States' Rights and Political Parties in North Carolina*, Baltimore, 1906.
Webster, Daniel, *Works* (ed. C. H. Van Tyne), Boston, 1853. *Letters* (ed. C. H. Van Tyne), New York, 1901.
Wentworth, John, *Congressional Reminiscences*, Chicago, 1882.
Wilson, Henry, *History of the Rise and Fall of the Slave Power* (2 vol.), Boston, 1874.
Wilson, Woodrow, *The Tariff*, New York, 1912. *The State*, New York, 1918.

INDEX

Abbott, Jacob: 294.
Abolition: 136, 203 (poets: 294). See also *Reformers* and *Slavery*.
Adams, Charles F.: 326.
* Adams, John: 18, 19, 22, 30, 39, 118, 119, 173.
Adams, John Q.: 31, 33, 96, 97, Mo. question 102, Pres. Campaign 111, President 119, 1828 campaign 127, 138; in House 165, 180, 183; Calhoun-Webster debate 199, crisis France, and character 209, Gag rule 210, Oregon question 264, Mexican War 277, 350.
Agrarianism: see *Democracy — Agrarian.*
Alamo, The: 214.
Alcott, Bronson: 294, 300, 394.
** Alien and Sedition Acts: 19. See also *Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions.*
Alston, Joseph: 39.
"American System," The: See *Clay.*
American Temperance Society, The: See *Temperance Society.*
Anti-Mason Party: 139, 162, 164.
Anti-Slavery Society: New England 181, Quaker 212, Liberty Party 266, 226. See *Slavery.*
Aristocracy: 10, 12, 16, 17, 34, 35, 156, 158, Cauhoun 280, 291, 320, 340, 398.
Articles of Confederation: See *Constitution.*
Arts: 392.
Ashburton Treaty: 253.
Ashley Report of 1842: 375.
Austin, Stephen: 213, 219. See *Texas.*

Bancroft, George: 294, 395.
Bank: 13, 84, 93, 1832 campaign 165, Jackson veto 169, 178, 207, 220; 1840 campaign 237, Tyler veto 249, 337.
Baptist: See *Church.*
Barn-Burners: 326.
Barry, Wm. T.: 141, 151.
Bath Ridge: 47.
Beauregard, G. T.: 288.
Beecher, H. W.: 395.
Bennett, J. G.: 124.
Bentham, Jeremy: 6, 175, 309.
Benton, Thomas H.: 107, 118, tariff abominations 129, 1828 campaign 138, Webster-Hayne debate 143, 165; bank 168, 180; tariff compromise 195, 1840 campaign 239, Mexican War 260, 273; Wilmot Proviso 277, cf. Clay and Calhoun 277, 286; Last Congress 339; 353, 391.
Berrien, John M.: 141, 258, 262.
Bill of Rights: 31, 211.
Birney, Jos. G.: 266.
Black Hawk: 176, 183.
Blair, Frank: 80.
Blanc, Louis: 313.
Blanqui, Louis A.: 314.
Bonham, J. B.: 215.
Bowie, James: 215.
Branch, John: 141, 151.

* In their broad principles the political philosophies of Calhoun, the Democrat, and Adams, the Federalist, were much alike, and identical interests might have brought them to identical conclusions. They agreed that property must rule by reason of inherent power, and that political justice was attainable only by a system of checks and balances which provided each important group with a defencive veto. In Adams' day, however, political antagonism was found in rival classes; in Calhoun's, the economic alignment had become sectional — the kernel of the State's-right doctrine. (See *Sources* — Parrington.)

** The Alien Act was never enforced; the Sedition Act died of inherent weakness.

Brook Farm: 300.
Brown, Charles B.: 293.
Brown, Jacob: 55, 72, 77.
Bryant, W. C.: 293, 326, 395.
Buchanan, James: 212, 250, 273, 286.
Bulfinch, Charles: See *Capitol.*
Burr, Aaron: 20, 23, 39, 219.
Butt-End Coon Hunters: 266.

Calhoun, John C.:
1782, Mar. 18, born at Calhoun Settlement, Abbeville County, S. C., 3.
1802, entered junior class of Yale College, 29.
1804, Sept. 12, graduated as bachelor of arts, 29.
1805, July 22 – 1806, July 28, law course at Litchfield, Conn., 29.
1807, Oct. 13, elected to House of Representatives (S.C.), 42.
1811, Jan. 8, married to his cousin, Floride Colhoun, only daughter of the Hon. John Ewing Colhoun,* 47.
1811, Nov. 6 – 1812, July 6, Twelfth Congress, first session. Calhoun in House of representatives, 54-63.
1812, Dec. 12, first speech on war resolutions, 55.
1812, Nov. 2 – 1812, Mar. 3, Twelfth Congress, second session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 67.
1813, May 24 – 1813, Aug. 2, Thirteenth Congress, first session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 68.
1813, Dec. 6 – 1814, April 18, Thirteenth Congress, second session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 72.
1814, Sept. 19 – 1815, Mar. 3, Thirteenth Congress, third session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 77.
1815, Jan. 8, speech on incorporation of Bank, 85, 94.
1815, Dec. 4 – 1816, April 30, Fourteenth Congress, first session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 89.
1816, Dec. 2 – 1817, Mar. 3, Fourteenth Congress, second session. Calhoun in House of Representatives, 89.
1817, Feb. 4, speech on internal improvements, 90.
1817, Oct. 8 – 1825, Mar. 3, Secretary of War under President Monroe, 96.
1823, nominated for Presidency, 115.
1825, Mar. 4 – 1832, Dec. 28, Vice-President under Presidents J. Q. Adams and Andrew Jackson, 119.
1825, made *Fort Hill* his permanent residence, 124.
1825, Mar. 4 – 1828, May 26, Calhoun president of Senate, 128. (*See Tariff of Abominations,* and *State Interposition.*)
1828, Dec. 1 – 1829, Mar. 3, Twentieth Congress, second session. Calhoun president of Senate, 132.
1828, Dec. 28, South Carolina Legislature adopts Calhoun's "Exposition," 135.
1829, March 4 – 1830, May 31, Twenty-first Congress, Calhoun president of Senate, 140
1830, Jan. 19-27, Webster-Hayne debate, 143.
1830, May, breach with Jackson, 148.
1830, Dec. 6 – 1831, Mar. 3, Twenty-first Congress, second session. Calhoun president of Senate, 161.
1831, July 26, "Address to the people of South Carolina," 163.
1831, Dec. 5 – 1832, July 16, Twenty-second Congress, first session. Calhoun president of Senate, 165.

* This branch of the family apparently retained the spelling "Colhoun."

1832, July 16, resigns the Vice-Presidency, 194.
1832, Dec. 12, elected by South Carolina Legislature to finish unexpired term of Senator Hayne, 194.
1832, Jan. 4, Calhoun sworn in as member of Senate, 194.
1832, Feb. 15-16, speech on the "Force Bill," 195.
1832, Feb. 26, speech on his resolutions in support of States' rights, and reply to Webster, 196.
1833, Dec. 2 – 1834, June 30, Twenty-third Congress, first session. Calhoun in Senate, 207.
1834, Dec. 1 – 1835, Mar. 4, Twenty-third Congress, second session. Calhoun in Senate, 207.
1835, Dec. 7 – 1836, July 4, Twenty-fourth Congress, first session. Calhoun in Senate. 210.
1836, Mar. 9, speech on abolition petitions, 211.
1837, Mar. 4 – 1839, Mar. 3, Twenty-fifth Congress. Calhoun in Senate, 235.
1839, Dec. 2 – 1841, Mar. 3, Twenty-sixth Congress. Calhoun in Senate, 239.
1841, Mar. 4 – 1842, Aug. 31, Twenty-seventh Congress. Calhoun in Senate, 244.
1842, Feb. 28, speech in defence of veto power, 251.
1842, Dec. 5 – 1843, Mar. 3, Twenty-seventh Congress, third session. Calhoun in Senate, 253.
1843, Mar. 4 – 1844, Mar. 6. Not in office. Candidate for Presidency, but withdrew Jan. 20, 1844, 257, 263.
1844, Mar. 6 – 1845, Mar. 6, Secretary of State under President Tyler, 256, 258.
1845, Nov. 26, elected by South Carolina Legislature to Senate, filling out unexpired term of Judge Huger, 268.
1845, Dec. 1 – 1846, Aug. 10, Twenty-ninth Congress, first session. Calhoun in Senate from Dec. 22, 270.
1846, Mar. 16, speech on Oregon, 272.
1846, Dec. 7 – 1847, Mar. 3, Twenty-ninth Congress, second session. Calhoun in Senate, 275.
1847, Feb. 19, speech on resolutions in regard to Wilmot Proviso, 276.
1847, Feb. 24, reply to Benton, 277.
1847, Mar. 9, address to the citizens of Charleston, 284.
1847, Dec. 6 – 1848, Aug. 14, Thirtieth Congress, first session. Calhoun in Senate, 325.
1848, June 27, speech on Oregon question, 327.
1848, Dec. 4 – 1849, Mar. 3, Thirtieth Congress, second session. Calhoun in Senate, 330.
1849, Jan., address to the Southern delegates in Congress, 331.
1849, Mar. 5-23, Thirty-first Congress, special executive session of Senate. Calhoun in Senate, 331.
1849, prepares disquisition on Government, and discourse on the Constitution, 335.
1849, Dec. 3 – 1850, Sept. 30, Thirty-first Congress, first session. Calhoun in Senate to Mar. 31, 338.
1850, Mar. 4, speech on slavery question, read by Mason of Virginia, 344.
1850, Mar. 13, last remarks in the Senate, 354.
1850, Mar. 31, death at Washington, 356.
Calhoun, Patrick: 36, 43.
California: Gold rush 337, admission 338 and 339, compromise 344; 348, 391.

Calvinism: See *Puritanism* and *Church*.
Canning, George: 110.
Capital: See *Washington, City of*.
Capitalism: 7, 19. See *Democracy — Industrial*.
Capitol: 22, 53, 76, 89, 101, 179, 235, 340, 354.
Carlyle, Thomas: 296, 394.
Carroll, Charles: 178.
Cass, Lewis: 161, 262, 285, 1848-candidacy 325, 339.
Channing, Wm. E.: 266, 297, 305.
Charles X: 174.
Charleston, City of: 36, 37, 47, 124, 161.
Chartism: 175, 309.
Chase, Salmon P.: 181, 342, 351, 352, 380, 398.
Chateaubriand, François R.: 111.
Cherokees: 122, 124.
Chesapeake, The: 29, 63.
Cheves, Langdon: 37, 54, 59, 68.
Church: Historic 9, 11, 304.
Baptist: 306, 346, schism 346.
Campbellite: 305.
Episcopalian: 183, 187, 188, in South 308, 346. See *Oxford Movement*.
Literature: See *Literature*.
Methodist: 168, 182, 224, schism 256, 306, 346, 371.
Mormon: 160, 267, 305.
Presbyterian and Congregational: See *Calvinism*.
Quaker: 212, 371.
Roman Catholic 267, 304, in South 308, Liberal Movement 308, 314; 346, 350.
Seventh Day Adventist: 305.
Unitarian: See *Puritanism*.
Clark, Wm.: 23.
Clay, Henry: 55, 57, 77, 82, 89, 91, 96, 102, 105, presidential campaign 114, duel with Randolph 118, Secretary of State 119; 136, 1828 campaign 138, Webster-Hayne debate 145, Senate 165, presidential campaign 165; 180, Randolph 189, 1832 defeat 191, 1833 tariff 193, 195; bank 207, France 208, Texas 219; 1840 campaign 237; triumph nationalists 244; conflict Tyler 247, individualism 248, bank 249, resigns Senate 253, 268; 1844 campaign 264, Mexican War 277, cf. Benton and Calhoun 277, 1848 campaign 326, Last Congress 339, Greeley tribute 336, Compromise speech 343; 353, 362.
Clinton, De Witt: 41, 159.
Clinton, George: 41.
Coleridge, S. T.: 296, 300, 302.
Commercialism: See *Democratic — Industrial*.
Communism: See *Labour*.
Compromise: The Great, 343, spirit of, 342, 354.
Concurrent Majorities: See *Democracy — Popular*.
Congregational: See *Church*.
Congress of Vienna: 76.
Conservatism: See *Democracy*.
Constitution: 16, 17, 31, 38, 58, 95, 104, slavery 120, nullification 131, Webster 137, Webster-Hayne debate 145, 162; Supreme Court 171, 190; Calhoun's resolutions of 1833, 195, 252; Calhoun-Webster debate 196, 252; Webster and Calhoun 330, 348; and law 378, Lincoln 399. See *Higher Law*, and *Disquisition on Government*.
Constitution, The: Battle with *Guerrière* 65, 221.
Corps de Belgique: See *Knights of the Golden Circle*.
Cosmopolitanism: See *Enlightenment*.
* Crallé, R. K.: 257, 355.
Crawford, Wm. H.: 55, 96, Presidency 111, 138, 153, 219.
Creeks: 219. See *War — 1812 — South*.
Creole, The: 254.
Crimean War: See *War*.
Crockett, David: 80, 215.
Cuba: 110, 185, 259, 330, 341, 343. See *Knights of the Golden Circle*.

* Editor of Calhoun's *Works*.

Dallas, George M.: 116.
Dallas, James: 85, 94.
Darwin, Charles: 392.
Dauphin, Lost: See *Louis XVII.*
Davis, Jefferson: 100, 177, 219, 269, 275, 285, 287, 339, 352, 403.
Declaration of Independence: 7, 105, 121, 189, 306, 328, 367, 369, 402.
Deism: 188, literature 295, 301; South 305.
Democracy: See *Government*, see Table of Contents.
* Agrarian: 4, 13, 17, 18, 23, 31, 32, 34, 36, 38, 91, Crawford party 112, 203, Southwest 214, 227; 342, 377, cf. industrialism 398. See *Minorities.*
Ideological: 22, 39, 47, 91, 157, 176, Calhoun-Webster debate 196; 339, Louisiana 230. See *Aristocracy* and *Whitman.*
Industrial: 4, 18, 37, 39, 91, 116, 136, 143, 148, 156, 167, 223, Whig-Republican Convention 1840, 237; 265; reformers 266; 290; communism 317; newspapers 383; cf. communism 389; cf. agrarianism 398. See *Middle Class.*
National: 117, 142, Webster-Hayne debate 145, 158, Supreme Court 170, Calhoun-Webster debate 196, 223, transition from poular 235, triumph 244, literature 303, gold rush 337, culture 389.
Popular: 38, 95, 116, 142, 158, 167, 177, Jackson 219, Western 225, Northwest 228, transition to nationalism 235, Calhoun on veto power 251, cultural effects 291. See *Majorities.*
* Progressive: See *Tocqueville.* See *Disquisition on Government.*
** Democratic Party: 17, 20, 40, 57, 48, first nat'l convention 166, 1840 campaign 237, 1844 campaign 264, 285; begins to split 319, 1848 convention 325.
Dew, Thomas R.: 306.
Dickens, Charles: 200, 309, 394.
Dickson, James: 214.
Disquisition on Government: 268, 359. See *South Carolina Exposition.*
Disunion: See *Secession.*
Douglas, Stephen: 107, 262, 269, 327, 339, 391, 403.
Dwight, Timothy: 21, 306.

Eaton, John H.: 128, 141, 151, 154; Peggy 148.
Education: 228, 363, Negro 371, press 382, 386.
Edwards, Jonathan: 297.
Election: See *Puritanism.*
Emancipation: See *Slavery.*
Emerson, R. W.: 294, 299, 300, 386, 394.
Empire of the Golden Circle: See *Knights of the Golden Circle.*
Encyclopedists: 4, 7.
Engels, F.: 316.
Enlightenment, Age of: 3, 4, Talleyrand 245, 362, 380, 390.
Episcopal: See *Church.*
Equality: See *Democracy.*
Erie Canal: 123, 158.
Everett, Edward: 254, 256, 386.
Express: 235, 389.

Faneuil Hall: 137.
Farragut, David: 75, 123, 192, 286.
Federalist: See *Republican Party.*
Floyd, John: 167, 262.
Foote, H. S.: 328, 353.
Force Bill: 192, 197, 201.
Fort Hill: 124, 333.
Fourier Phalanxes: 300.
Foxes: See *Black Hawk.*
Franklin, Benj.: 30.
Fraternity: See *Democracy.*
Freedom: See *Liberty.*
Free Soilers: 326.

* Calhoun's principles died because they were associated with a doomed cause. The idea of a Greek democracy — i.e., the vital democratic principle of decentralized powers — affronted the current idealism of America, and thus did harm to agrarian democracy.

** The old party of '98 was called Republican; but to avoid confusion it is here referred to as Democratic.

Fugitive Slave Law: 332, 344, 402. See *Slavery*.
Fulkerson, H. F.: 280.
Fuller, Margaret: 300.

Gag Rule: 210.
Gallatin, Albert: 68, 77, 84, 184, 186.
Garibaldi, Giuseppe: 319.
Garrison, W. L.: 181, 210, 266, 305, 351, 352, 380.
Ghent: See *Treaty of Ghent*.
Giddings, Joshua: 272, 351, 380.
Government: See *Constitution* and *Democracy*.
General: 13, 17, 19, 60, Missouri 104, Webster-Hayne debate 145, Calhoun's address to the South Carolinians 163, bank 168, Jackson and coördinate 190, nullification 190, progress of centralization 331, 345.
Nation: Conflict States 148, Supreme Court 173, 194, 284, 345.
States: 13, 18, 70, Massachusetts Remonstrance 62, Hartford Convention 83, Crawford Party 112, Right of interposition 131, Webster-Hayne debate 145, 148; Supreme Court 171, territorial expansion 258, 276; Calhoun's address to the South Carolinians 284, Disquisition on Government 366, Constitution 381, Lincoln 399.
Union: 30, 31, 90, Webster 155, 284, 331; disunion 344, 403.
Grant, Ulysses S.: 288, 426.
Greeley, Horace: 243, 317, 333, 336, 350, 405.
Green, Duff: 130, 154, 162, 164, 168.
Gregory XVI: 174.
Grundy, Felix: 54, 55, 199.

Hamilton, Alexander: 16, 18, 19, 23, 160, 169, 369.
Hamilton, James: 113, 134, 163, 189.
Hancock, John: 12, 13.
Harrison, W. H.: 65, nomination 237, slavery 242, inauguration 243, death 246.
Hartford Convention: 83, 91, 145, 190. See *Republican Party*.
Hawthorne, Nathaniel: 394.
Hayne, R. Y.: 49, 122, debates Webster 143, Jefferson's birthday 157, 193, 269.
Hegel, Georg W. F.: 295, 302, 394.
Henry, Patrick: 19, 30, 41, 122, 185, 231.
Higher Law: 203, 342, 351, 374, 380, 384, 402. See *Reformers*.
Holy Alliance: 88, 109, 176. See *Monroe Doctrine*.
Houston, Sam: 79, 138, 180, 181, Texan revolt 213, President of Texas 219, 288, 332, 353.
Hugo, Victor: 311, 394.
Hull, Isaac: 65.
Humanitarianism: 9, 398. See *Reformers*.
Hunkers: 326.

Impressment: See *War – 1812*.
Individualism: Protestant 8, political 23-38, 247, literature 299, 362, 398.
Individual Liberty: See *Liberty*.
Industrialism: See *Democracy – Industrial*.
Ingham, S. D.: 141.
Intellectual Revolution: 18th Century 7; 1846 312.
Intellectuals: South 292, New York 293, New England 294, England 309, France 310.
Inventions: 4, 159, 223, 235, 290, 337, 392.

Jackson, Andrew: Creek War 67; Battle of New Orleans 78, 80; 229, declines war office 96, quarrel Calhoun 98, Governor Florida 99, presidential campaign 114, alliance Calhoun 120, 1828 campaign 126-138, tariff 130, President 139, inauguration and administration 140, quarrel Calhoun 148, Jefferson birthday dinner 151, compared with Calhoun 156, new cabinet 161, 1832 campaign 165-178, second inauguration 179, results

of re-election 191, South Carolina 192, Force Bill 192, compromise tariff 195, bank 207, France 208, Gag rule 210, Texas 219-221, results of reign 219, distribute public funds 220; 244, 252, 367.
Jackson, T. J. "Stonewall": 288.
James, Henry: 310.
Jay, John: 18, 20.
Jefferson, Thomas: 7, 12, 16, 20, 23, 30, 33, 36, 39, 53, 91, 96, 102, 104, 116, 119, birthday dinner 150, 169, 186, Louisiana 231, 244, 306, 309, 340, 366, 369, 375, cf. Lincoln 398.
Jewett, J. C.: 280.
Judiciary: See *Supreme Court.*

Kansas Bill: 402.
Kant, Immanuel: 295, 302.
Keble, John: See *Oxford Movement.*
Kemble, Fanny: 180, 395.
Kendall, Amos: 142.
Kennedy, Jos. P.: 293.
* Kentucky and Virginia Resolutions: 19, 83, 149, 164, 189. See *Alien and Sedition Acts.*
Key, Francis S.: 77, 184.
King, Rufus: 108.
"Kitchen Cabinet": 142, 154, 162.
** Knights of the Golden Circle: 259. (Called "Corps de Belgique" in Missouri for reasons of secrecy.)
Kossuth, Louis: 309, 319.
Ku Klux Klan: See *Knights of the Golden Circle.*

Labour: Slavery 135, 202, 223, 243, 313, 369, communism 317, slavery 374, England and New England 375, reform 385, communism and middle class 388, communism and capitalism 389.
Lafayette, Marquis de: 7, 123, 174, 181, 219.
La Frénière: 231.
Laissez-faire: See *Individualism.*
Lamar, M. B.: 217.
Lamartine, Alphonse: 313.
Langdon, John: 42.
Law: See *Constitution.*
Latter-Day Saints: See *Church — Mormon.*
Ledru-Rollin: 313, 315.
Lee, Robert E.: 286, 288.

* Jefferson's original draft contains this sentence. "Where powers are assumed (by the federal Government) which have not been delegated, a *nullification* of the act is the rightful remedy; but every State has a natural right in cases not within the contract (*casus non fœderis*) to *nullify* of their own authority all assumptions of power by others within their limits." The Kentucky Legislature passed the resolutions substantially as written, except the nullification clause was toned down. Jefferson sent a copy to Madison with the request that he lay the resolutions before the Virginia Legislature; whereupon Madison drew up resolutions in briefer and more guarded language affirming the compact theory, the remedy accorded an aggrieved State for unconstitutional federal legislation being the right to "interpose" rather than "nullify."

** The secret organization was formed to unite the Southern masses (the aristocracy already being a solid class) for three principal objects: the acquisition of Cuba, Mexico and Nicarauga; the promotion of Southern interests; and, particularly, the circumvention of Abolitionist propaganda and the prevention of federal encroachment.

The organization was by Castles: Grand Castles, or State Legions, represented by a Grand United States or American Legion, each with its own military laws; and divisions by smaller local Castles.

Three degrees were given: the Military, the Financial, and the Governmental. The Castle itself consisted of an outer temple for the reception of neophytes, and an inner temple for their initiation and for meetings. Over the seat of the Chief was suspended a huge bronze crescent symbolizing the rising sun of the new Empire, with fifteen stars representing the States. The altar of the temple was in the shape of a sun-dial with fifteen stars at the base and on top a risen noonday sun on which rested a human skull. The members in session wore the knightly garb: a helmet emblazoned with small silver spear and silver crescent, a coat of mail, and a sword. The password was "Calhoun."

There is a tradition that when the Knights were disbanded (the leaders were hanged at Indianapolis) the organization was carried on in the Ku Klux Klan. The latter is not to be confused with the modern organization, the original Klan having been an organization of the highest integrity. There is also a tradition that the original Klan has lingered on in a college fraternity limited to the South. (*Kuklos,* circle.)

(Compare with the organization of the Societé des Saisons.)

Legaré, Hugh S.: 124.
Levees: See *White House.*
Lewis, Meriwether: 24.
Lewis, Wm. B.: 142.
Liberty: 373, 379. See *Government — States, Democracy — Ideological,* and *Disquisition on Government.*
Liberty Party: See *Republican Party.*
Lincoln, Abraham: 177, 219, 232, 256, 274, 327, 333, 339, cf. Jefferson 398.
Literature: 192, 296, 301, 394.
Livingston, Edward: 79, 141, Secretary of State 161, 186, 191.
Locke, John: 3, 31, 190, 361.
Longfellow, H. W.: 65, 294, 305, 395.
* Louis XVII: 308.
Louis XVIII: 75, 87.
Louis Napoleon: 319, 325.
Louis Philippe: 174, 181, 312, 319, 325.
Louisiana: 23, 101, 231, 258.
Lovejoy, E.: 266.
Lowndes, William: 37, 54, 93, 97, 112, 115, 275.
Lyell, Charles: 362, 371, 392.

Macauley, Lord: 175, 223, 394.
Macon, Nathaniel: 55, 89, 108, 116.
Madison, James: 40, 53, 58, 63, 69, 76, 84, 88, 114, 183, Constitution 199, 219.
Maine: 102, 104, 254, 258.
Majorities: See *Democracy — Popular.*
Manifest Desiny: See *Millennium.*
Manufacturing: See *Democracy — industrial.*
Marcy, W. L.: 141, 326.
Marshall, John: 19, 21, 22, 76, Jackson 140, 170, 172, 184; Randolph 188, 219, 224, 293.
Martineau, Harriet: 180.
Marx, Karl: 316, 385, 388.
Mason, George: 185, 275.
Mason, James M.: 345, 355.
Massachusetts Remonstrance: See *Government — States.*
Mather, Cotton: 297, 305.
Maysville Road: 142, 167.
Mazzini, Giuseppe, 39, 315, 319.
McDuffie, George: 122, 200, 201.
McLane, Lewis: 161.
McLeod, Alexander: 255.
Melville, Herman: 395, 397.
Memphis Convention: 269.
Methodist: See *Church.*
Metternich, Count von: 76, 111, 174, 246, 320.
Mexican War: See *War — Mexican.*
Mexico: 109, 212. See *Texas.*
Middle Class: 143, 175, triumph nationalism 244, plutocracy, 220, 267; revolution of 1846 291, 297; South 307, 312; Marxian 317, 321; plutocracy as ruling class 386, Reublican Party 398, Lincoln 400. See *Democracy — Industrial.*

* That Calhoun considered a monarchy would be the logical form of government should the growing spirit for centralization triumph, is a probability; but for the tradition that, looking towards this eventuality, he acted as guardian for the son of the Lost Dauphin, there is no real evidence. The story ran that Count Charles Mercy Argenteau took the Dauphin, disguised as a girl, to Holland whence he was transported to Canada by the Duchesse d'Orleans (known as Madame de Rion), and that under the latter name the Dauphin became an officer in the Canadian army, married an American girl, and before his death confided his only son to Calhoun.

That Calhoun was greatly interested in the contemporary fate of Prince Louis Charles is affirmed by his family and friends. It was generally believed in his time that the shoemaker Simon's son died in the Temple and his body was passed off as that of the Dauphin who was spirited away in a laundry cart. So eminent an authority as Le Nôtre believed this story, though he concluded that the only valid claimant to the Dauphin's identity died at Bicêtre prison on May 8, 1812. Napoleon once frightened some aspiring intriguers by the remark that "If I wished to disconcert all ambitions I would make a man appear this instant who would astonish the universe." When Louis XVIII mounted the throne in 1814 the bodies of the murdered Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette were disinterred and regally buried; but no mention was made of the Dauphin nor was a Mass said for him. Chateaubriand wrote in the *Tribune of the Chamber of Peers* of January 9, 1818: "What has become of that Royal ward left under the tutelage of the executioner, that orphan who might say like David's heir: My father and mother have abandoned me!" Where is the companion of those afflictions, the brother of the orphan girl of the Temple? Where can I address to him this terrible and too well-known question: 'Capet, dost thou sleep?'"

Mill, John S.: 392.
Millennium: 159, 222, 224, Modern State 305. See *Jackson, Andrew.*
Minorities: 16, 23, 38, 39. See *Democracy* and *Disquisition on Government.*
Missouri Compromise: 101, 267, 328, 345, 352.
Modern State, The: 303. See *Government.*
Monroe Doctrine: 109, 259.
Monroe, James: 18, 58, 70, 88, 96, 105, 111, 114, 153, 168.
Montesquieu, Baron: 4, 7, 222, 365, 399.
Moore, Thomas: 186.
Moral Law: See *Higher Law.*
Mormon: See *Church.*
Morse, S. F. B.: 223, 290.

Napoleon Bonaparte: 19, 24, 48, 49, 59, 70, 75, 77, 87, 288.
Nashville Convention: 341.
Nationalism: 9, 11, 16, 33, Calhoun 48, 56, 90, 148. See *Democracy — National.*
Native American Party: See *Know-Nothing Party.*
Naturalism: 160, 294, Emerson 279. See *Transcendentalism.*
Navy: 59, 93. See *Privateers,* and ships by individual names.
Newman, John H.: 302, 308. See *Oxford Movement.*
New Orleans: 229, Battle of, see *War — 1812.*
Newspapers: See *Press.*
Newton, Isaac: 3, 5, 361.
Non-Importation Act: 68.
Non-Intercourse Acts: See *Restrictive System.*
Northwest Territory: 167, 254, 257, Calhoun 260, Polk 267, 272, 337, 345.
Nullification: Tariff of Abominations 130, Calhoun's State Interposition 131, Pennsylvania and Massachusetts 149, clubs, 150, Jefferson birthday dinner 150, South Carolina 165, 189; Convention of 1833 200, Massachusetts 402. See *Secession, Kentucky Resolutions, South Carolina Exposition,* and *Disquisition on Government.*

"*Old Ironsides*": See *Constitution, The.*
Orders-in-Council: 25, 48, 57, 59, 68, 69.
Oregon: See *Northwest Territory.*
Owen, Robert: 309, 316.
Oxford Movement: 183, 308. See *Church — Episcopal.*

Pakenham, Sir Edward: 80, 82.
Palfrey, John G.: 294.
Panama Canal: 269, 337, 341.
Parker, Theodore: 299, 305.
Periodicals: 294. See *Literature.*
Perry, O. H.: 72.
Petigru, James L.: 124, 150.
Phillips, Wendell: 305.
Pierce, Franklin: 288.
Pinckney, Charles C.: 20.
Pinckney, William: 102.
Pius IX: 314.
Plantation: Description of, 44-47.
Plutocracy: See *Democracy — Industrial* and *Middle Class.*
Poe, Edgar A.: 293, 394, 397.
Poinsett, Joel: 191.
Polk, James K.: Campaign 265, Texas and Oregon 267, Mexican War 270, 286, 327, 337.
Porter, David: 63, 73, 213, 286.
Presbyterian: See *Church.*
Prescott, Wm. H.: 294, 395.
Press: 210, 224, 290, 350, reform 382.
Privateers: 63, 73.
Progress: See *Invention* and *Disquisition on Government.*
Proletariat: See *Labour.*
Property: Rights of, see *Liberty.*
Proudhon, Pierre J.: 313.
Puritanism: 5, 8, 9, 33, 168, 182, Western 226, literature 294, Unitarianism 305, Modern State 305, South 306, 371, 384; industry 386. See *Church.*
Pusey, Edward B.: 308. See *Oxford Movement.*

Quincy, Josiah:

Railroads: 159, 181, 200, 224, 235, Memphis Convention 269, 289, 337, 341, 391, 400, 402.
Randolph, John: 18, 55, 57, 69, 91, 92, 94, 102, 107, 117, 121, 123, tariff 129, 184; England 186, character 187, cf. Marshall 188, 199, 306.
Reform Bill: English of 1832, 175.
Reformers: 11, 203, literature 297, 373, New England 382. See *Slavery* and *Anti-Slavery Societies.*
Regionalism: See *Sectionalism.*
Reign of Terror: 14. Footnote, 426.
Religion: See *Church.*
Renaissance: 3, 5.
* Republican Party: 13, 17, 19, 20, 24, 40, 62, 70, 83, 139, Webster-Hayne debate 145, Supreme Court 173, 190, 208; first Whig Convention 221, Whig-Republican Convention 237, 1844 campaign 264, 1848 convention 325-6, Disquisition on Government 366, Marxian middle class 389, former pragmatic elements merge 398.
Restrictive System: 60. See *War — 1812.*
Revolution: See *War.* American, 1776, 7, 12, 30, 34.
1800, 18.
1828, 53.
1840, 235.
1861, 325, 400, 405.
French, 1782, 4, 7, 14, 174.
1830, 174.
1848, 312, 319.
Texas: See *Texas.*
Intellectual: See *Intellectual Revolution.*
** Revolutionary Philosophy: 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 23, 147, 312. See *Disquisition on Government.*
Rhett, Robert B.: 122, slavery 201, secession 202, 275, 333.
Romanticism: 11, 294, literature 301.
Rousseau, J. J.: 4, 5, 190, 295, 302, 365.
Royal, Anne: 180.
Rusk, T. J.: 217.
Russell, Jonathan: 77.
Russell, Lord: 175.

Sacs: See *Black Hawk.*
San Jacinto, Battle of: 217.
Santa Anna, General: 214.
Schelling, F. W. J. von: 295, 302.
Schools: See *Education.*
Science: See *Progress.*
Scott, Dred: 401, 402.
Scott, Winfield: 72, 77, 184, 192, 286, 288.
Seaton, W. W.: 97, 183.
Secession: New England 23, 25, 31, 62, 149, 162, 190.
Pennsylvania, 149, 190.
South Carolina 130, 135, 150, 167, 189, 192, 201, 307, 381, 402.
South 102, 204.
Sectionalism: See *Government — States.*
Seminoles: 98.
Sentimentalism: See *Romanticism.*
Sequin, J. N.: 215.
Seward, W. H.: 139, 237, 264, 274, 327, 342, Compromise 350, 354, 402.
*** Sherman, W. T.: 288.
Simms, W. G.: 124.
Sioux: 177.

* Though not strictly a historical party, the Republican Party founded by Lincoln traces its lineage through the various pragmatic elements that went into its organization: the Federalist, the Whig, the National, the Whig Republican, the abolitionist and anti-slavery parties, and the middle-class industrialists. For convenience these are grouped under the heading of "Republican Party."

** There were three main currents: the identification of the natural and civil rights of man as proclaimed by Rousseau; the conservative "English" *a priori* science of government as advanced by Montesquieu; and the mechanical utilitarianism of the Encyclopedists.

*** The story of Sherman weeping on the battlefield at the slaughter of horses, while insensible to the wanton destruction of human lives and property, is matched by Farragut at the Norfolk Ordinance "waiting for the voice of God" bidding him "go in." See *Sentimentalism* and *Reformers.*

Slade, William: 212.
Slave Insurrections: San Domingo (Toussaint l'Ouverture), 102, 203, 230, 372.
Mississippi (John Murrell) 204.
South Carolina (Denmark Vesey), 108, 203.
Virginia (Nat Turner) 203.
Slavery: 13, 92, Missouri 101, 120; labour 135, 181; Great Britain 181, secession 202, emancipation 203, Gag Rule 210, District of Columbia 211, Harrison 242, Ashburton Treaty 254, courts 255, territories 258, Great Britain and Texas 260, 1844 campaign 264, Wilmot Proviso 272-5, religion and South 306, justification 306, 1848 party slogan 319, Cass 325, 1848 Whig-Republican Convention 326, Squatter Sovereignty 327, 333, 339; Compromise 344, Calhoun's speech 345, Seward 351, institutional 369, reformers 374, Constitution 379, Lincoln 401, Union 403. See *Anti-Slavery Society, Nullification, Secession.*
Slidell, John: 270.
Smith, Adam: 6.
Smith, Joseph: 160, 267.
Smith, S. H.: 180.
Smithsonian Institute: 265.
Smith, William: 122, 144.
Socialism: 23. See *Labour.*
* Societé des Saisons: 314. See *Blanc*, and *Knights of the Golden Circle.*
South Carolina Exposition (State Interposition): 38, 131, 143, 163, 164. See *Disquisition on Government* and *Nullification.*
South Carolina Resolutions (1828): 190.
Southern Congress: 256, 263, 331.
Sovereignty: See *Government—State.*
Sparks, Jared: 294.
Spencer, Herbert: 381, 392.
State Interposition: See *Nullification*, and *South Carolina Exposition.*
States Rights: See *Government—State.*
Stephens, Alexander H.: 238, 339, 353.
Stevens, Thaddeus: 342, 398, 426.
Subterraneans: 266.
Sumner, Charles: 181, 305, 351, 395.
Supreme Court: Early unimportance 22, 53, 170; Federalists foresee use 21, 173; usurpation of power and nationalism 96, 122, 130, 170; Jefferson 172, Jackson 167-9, Randolph 185, Lincoln 399 and 401; Calhoun 164, States Rights 400, labour 224; 252, 328.

Talleyrand, Charles M. de: 19, 245.
Talmadge, James, Jr.: 100.
Tammany Hall: 266
Taney, Roger B.: 161, 207.
Tariff: 91, 92, 1819 114, 120; Charleston memorial 125, abominations 127, nullification 131, Calhoun 164, 1832 campaign 165, South Carolina 189, 1833 compromise 191, 195; campaign 1840 237.
Taylor, Zachary: 219, Texas 267, Mexican War 270, 286, 287; presidential nomination 319, 326; inauguration 336, 350.
Tecumseh, Chief: 65.
Temperance Society: 182, 241, 386, West 264.
Texas: Revolt 214, Republic 219, 254, 258; Calhoun 260, 267, 337, 350. See *Mexico.*
Thoreau, H. D.: 294, 300, 394.
Thornton, William: See *Capitol.*
Ticknor, George: 395.
Tippecanoe Campaign: 239.
Tocqueville, Alexis de: 221, 364, 394.
Toombs, Robert: 219, 238, 332, 339, 353.

* Six members and a chief (Sunday) constituted a Week; four Weeks and a chief (July) constituted a Month; three Months and a leader (Spring) constituted a Season; four Seasons and the principal chief constituted the Year. The organization, thus limited to a thousand, was maintained in absolute secrecy and was spy-proof.

Transcendentalism: See *Puritanism.*
Travis, Colonel: 215.
Treaty of Ghent: 82, 209, 254.
Treaty of 1783: 49.
Turnbull, R. J.: 150.
Tyler, John: 200, 237, President 246, conflict with Whigs 247, bank veto 249, 1844 campaign 256, Oregon 261, 265, 337.

* Union: See *Government — Union.*
* United States South: 331.

Valparaiso, Battle of: See *War — 1812.*
Van Buren, Martin: 112, 115, 128, 138, Secretary State 141, Calhoun and Jackson quarrel 149-155, 161, 186; Texas 219, inauguration 221, panic 235, 1840 campaign 238, 1844 campaign 256, 264; splits party 326.
Virginia Resolutions: See *Kentucky Resolutions.*
Voltaire, F. M. A. de: 4, 5, 7, 305.

Walker, Robert J.: 265, 285.
War: 1812, 41, 42, 47, declaration 58; West, (Northern boundary, Lakes and Canada), 64, 71, 72; sea 65, 73; Atlantic coast 67, 76; South (Creek) 67, Battle New Orleans 78; Treaty Ghent 82.
Crimean: 391.
Mexican: 260, 270, 285.
Texas: see *Texas.*
War Hawks: See *War — 1812.*
Washington, City of: 13, 76, society 182, 185.
Washington, George: 13, 16, 18, 19, 30, 39, 122, 156, 293, 344.
Webster, Daniel: 62, 69, 70, 72, 83, 93, 118, 119; Bunker Hill 123, change to protection 128, manufacturers dinner 137, 1828 campaign 138, debate Hayne 143, *22nd* Congress 165, bank 169, 207; Dartmouth 171; 180; Force Bill 192, France 208, 223; 1840 campaign 237; 253; McLeod case 255, Mexican War 277, cf. Clay and Calhoun 284, 1848 campaign 326, Calhoun and territories 330, Last Congress 339, speech on Compromise 349; 352, 362.
Weed, Thurlow: 264, 326, 350.
West Point: 59, 100.
Whigs: See *Republican Party.*
Whigs (English): 175.
White House: levees 179.
Whitman, Walt: 395.
Whittier, J. G.: 181, 294, 305, 352.
Wilmot Proviso: 273, 326, 327.
Wilson, Henry: 327.
Wirt, William: 165, 293.
Wordsworth, William: 301.
Wright, Silas: 326.

Yancey, W. L.: 262, 275.
Yucatan: 341.

* Though the War Between the States was allegedly fought by the North to prevent the Southern Confederacy's withdrawal from the Union, such separation is exactly what the North insisted upon after winning the war — that is, the exclusion of the Southern States from the Union. Thaddeus Stevens's plan was to promote the Republican Party to a place of *permanent* power as the "party of the Union." President Grant's Act of May, 1870, suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* in the South, followed by the wholesale arrest of Southerners, inaugurated the subsequent Reign of Terror; and the powers granted by the same Act to federal judges to exclude whom they liked from juries, and to bring all trials to a quick consummation, brought the federal courts to a parity with the Tribune of the French Terror.